M. L

JEWS

IN

SOUTH CAROLINA

By

Barnett Abraham Elzas

FOUR
VOLUMES
IN ONE

JOSEPH SALVADOR

Jewish merchant prince
who came to South Carolina

by

Barnett Abraham Elzas

Charleston, South Carolina
The Daggett Printing Co.
1903

JOSEPH SALVADOR.

JEWISH MERCHANT PRINCE WHO CAME TO SOUTH CAROLINA.

He Raised a Million Pounds for the British Government at Two Hours' Notice and was Held in High Esteem in England—English Historians Know Nothing of His Later Career, which is Fully Revealed in the Records Here—He Came to this State, where he Owned 100,000 Acres of Land, and, After a Residence of Two Years, Died in Charleston, at the Age of 36—He was the Uncle and Father-in-law of the Patriot Francis Salvador.

(By Dr Barnett A. Elzas, Rabbi of K. K. Beth Elohim.)

Before proceeding with my narrative I would again like to explain to my readers that I am at the present time merely printing a portion of my notes. These notes running as they do into thousands of foolscap pages, had become so unwieldy by reason of their bulk, that I thought it well to put at least a part of them into shape, so that I could handle them to better advantage in future. My correspondence, too, in many quarters, has been quite extensive, but much information that I expect to obtain is not yet in my possession. Till now I have dealt almost exclusively with the records existing in South Carolina. There is not much material outside of this State but I hope that before writing my story in detail I shall have had access to several records in family Bibles, which are of historical interest and which are in the possession of people who no longer live here. These records will help to fill in the details of family history when of special interest, though their absence will not be of any

[illegible]

fore when the sufferings of poor humanity were to be relieved. He was president of the Congregation, and one of the most efficient members of the original Committee of Portuguese Deputies. Notwithstanding the extensive financial and mercantile transactions in which he was engaged, he devoted a portion of his time to the improvement of the condition of the needy. He not only gave largely to all existing institutions, but was ever seeking new plans for conquering the hydra-headed evil of pauperism. Now he would help to establish a new society like that intended to assist Jewish young men in earning their livelihood by hard work, and which, unfortunately, was unsuccessful. At another time he would be found asking permission of the Wardens to enter into a speculation on behalf of some deserving families in humble circumstances. He was always a liberal donor to the necessitous. Joseph Jessurun Rodrigues was a partner in the well-known house of Francis and Joseph Salvador which, after the death of Sampson Gideon, repeatedly negotiated loans for the British Government. We cannot tell at precisely what period the name of Salvador was first adopted, but certainly it must be in the early part of the last century, though it does not occur in the Synagogue registers until about 1760.

"Personally, Joseph Salvador, to style him by the most familiar designation, was popular, and enjoyed considerable repute among Jew and Gentile; albeit, when he appeared in a theatre on one occasion after the passing of the Naturalization Bill in 1753, he and his party were hooted, and were constrained to withdraw, to the utter disgrace of the civilized and Christian audience. The principal part of his career was accompanied by unbounded prosperity. He had vastly increased the

wealth he had inherited, and he was the first Jew who had been appointed Director of the East India Company. He constructed a handsome house in White Hart Court, Bishopgate street, which bore until recent times, if it does not still bear, his name, and in the N. E. corner of one of the cellars may yet be seen the foundation-stone, with an inscription laid upon it by his daughter, Judith Salvador. He also was the owner of a country residence, with an extensive park, at Tooting.

"Joseph Salvador was less fortunate in his latter days. Misfortunes began to befall him. He lost heavily in consequence of the earthquake at Lisbon, he holding much property in various shapes in that city, though this did not appear to affect him much. It was the failure of the Dutch East India Company that brought ruin on him, and that proved almost a calamity to many of the rich Portuguese Jews of England and of Holland. This disaster was a great blow to those communities, from which they found it difficult to recover. As for Joseph Salvador, he never raised his head again. All his available property in Europe little by little disappeared; and his last days were spent in obscurity. The family were still possessed of some tracts of land in America, which were in charge of a steward. A nephew of Joseph Salvador, Francis, determined to undertake a voyage to the new continent. It is said that Mrs Joshua Mendes Da Costa, a daughter of Joseph Salvador, gave up a part of her marriage settlement to furnish funds for the expedition. Francis started to retrieve the family fortunes. In due course letters came advising his safe arrival to the new continent, and announcing his intention of seeking his property. He never wrote again. A long silence ensued, and then it was reported that the unhappy Salvador

had been murdered and scalped by Indians!

"It is related that in 1802 an American arrived in Amsterdam and waited upon Mrs Texeira de Mattos, Salvador's eldest daughter, and offered her $10,000 to sign a deed giving up all claim on the American property. The lady declined the transaction. In 1812 the stranger once more returned and repeated his offer. He alleged that he was the grandson of Salvador's former steward; that the land in Mr Salvador's time had been a tract of barren forests and utterly valuless; that now it was covered with villages and towns and that he himself had a good holding title thereto. Finally he added that, during the War of Independence, British subjects had forfeited all their rights to property in the United States, and that she could advance no claim whatever to the land. Under these circumstances Mrs Texeira De Mattos, who was 80 years of age at that time, and who had not the slightest idea as to the State or part of the Union in which the demesne was situated, accepted the sum rendered and signed the required assignment, which thus conferred a valid selling title on the descendant of the steward. The last male representative of the family of Salvador or Jessurun Rodrigues was a member of Lloyd's, and is believed to have died about 1830. In this manner terminated that antient and honorable lineage." ("Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History," pp 161-4.)

Let us now look at our Charleston records and see what they have to tell us. They will anable us to separate the facts from traditions which, while containing an element of truth, are largely erroneous.

First as to the date at which the name of Salvador was first adopted. The Charleston College is the fortunate possessor of a most interesting document, the

original "grant of arms" from the Herald's College, London, to Francis Salvador, the grandfather of the Revolutionary patriot. This document has been copied by Mr A. S. Salley, Jr. and was printed in the South Carolina Historical Magazine for January, 1902. In his application for this grant of arms in 1714 Francis Salvador states that he is a son of Joseph Salvador, late of Amsterdam, and that he was made a citizen of England, (as Francis Salvador,) in 1710. It is worthy of note, however, that in the records of the old Bevis Marks Synagogue, London, which have been printed in the "Memorial Volume written to celebrate the 200th anniversary of the inauguration of the Antient Synagogue of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews" ("not published—for presentation only.") and a copy of which was generously presented to me by the Haham and the Mahamad of that Congregation, the names of Jessurun Rodrigues, Jacob Jessurun Rodrigues and Joseph Jessurun Rodrigues occur in the lists of members between 1760 and 1794. It would thus seem that the name of Salvador had already been adopted by the family in Amsterdam—possibly even in Portugal in their commercial transactions, while they still retained the original name of Rodrigues or Jessurun Rodrigues in the Synagogue. It is not unreasonable to surmise that Salvador was the Marrano name of the family. And now for the records.

We have seen that when misfortune overtook Joseph Salvador he was still possessed of land in South Carolina. Indeed, he was a very extensive land-owner, for he owned no less than 100,000 acres. The history of this land is very interesting.

In the Mesne Conveyance Records, Vol F 3, p 122, we have the deed of Joseph Salvador's purchase of this land recorded. It

is dated November 27, 1755. John Hamilton, late of the Parish of St George, Hanover Square, in the County of Middlesex, but now of Charles Town, in the Province of South Carolina, in consideration of £2,000 sterling, money of Great Britain, sells to Joseph Salvador, of Lime street, merchant, 100,000 acres of land situated at Ninety Six, in the Province of South Carolina. We hear nothing further of this land till 1769, when, as we have seen, Joseph Salvador gives Richard Andrews Rapley, then on his departure into foreign parts, his power of attorney to look after his interests in South Carolina and to sell some 45,000 acres. (F 4, p 243.) The records show that Rapley succeeded in disposing of a good portion of this land.

The first transaction on record occurs after the arrival of Francis Salvador in South Carolina. In Vol O 4, p 12, we have a mortgage recorded (I erroneously referred to this as a simple conveyance in my last article) from Joseph Salvador per Rapley to Francis Salvador, of 5,130 acres of land at Ninety Six. It is dated May 31, 1774, though the transaction was concluded before Francis Salvador left England, in October, 1773. On October 29, 1773, Joseph Salvador per Rapley sells to Abraham Prado, Francis Salvador's step-father, 1,062 acres for a consideration of £2,124, lawful currency of South Carolina. (F 4, 191.) On the same date he sells to Abraham Prado, 1,638 acres more. (F 4, 200.) On May 16, 1774, he sells to Francis Salvador 221 acres. (M 4, 286.) On May 24, 1774, he sells 1,420 acres to Mathew Edwards. (M 4, 355.) On June 20, 1774, he sells to Andrew Williamson 1,795 acres. (M 4, 362.) On February 23, 1775, we have seen that Joseph Salvador conveys to Rebecca Mendes Da Costa 20,000 acres of land, to satisfy a judgment which she had obtained against him. (T 4, 1.) On March

31, 1775, he sells to John Lesley 450 acres. (Z 4, 286.) On December 8, 1777, he sells to Nicholas Eveleigh 3,022 acres. (Y 4, 236.) On April 13, 1778, he sells to Benjamin Mitchell 300 acres. (Z 4, 252.) On April 29, 1778, he sells 1,460 acres to Nicholas Eveleigh. (Y 4, 228.) Also another tract of 2,900 acres, (Y 4, 241,) and a third tract of 1,048 acres. (Y 4, 243.) On October 6, 1779, he sells to John McCord 500 acres. (K 5, 57.) On November 3, 1779, he sells 1,013 acres to Thomas Sanders. (N 5, 201.) The last recorded deed is dated April 21, 1783, when Joseph Salvador, "having occasion for the sum of £1,000, mortgages his plantation, "Cornacre," of 5,100 acres, to William Stephens, of Lime street, London, Packer." (N 5, 81.)

In 1783 Joseph Salvador was still in London. All his transactions till now have been made per Richard Andrews Rapley, his attorney. He had been living on the money he obtained from the sale of his lands in South Carolina—comparatively little in truth—but it is pleasant to know that he must have had enough to live on comfortably. As we have seen he had till now disposed of about half of his property. He was still possessed of some 50,000 acres of land.

In 1784, when Joseph Salvador was 84 years of age, he came to South Carolina. On April 3, 1784, there is a deed recorded in Charleston of Joseph Salvador, "now of Ninety Six District," revoking his former letters of attorney to Richard Andrews Rapley. (K 5, 135.) It is surely pathetic to think of a man at his time of life coming to a new world to seek the wreckage of his former fortune. He did not remain long, however, at Ninety Six, for on August 9, 1785, we find a power of attorney recorded from William Stephens to Joseph Salvador, "now of Charles Town." (S 5, 143.)

Of his life and doings in Charleston we know nothing, for the records are silent. We should indeed like to have known something of how he spent the last months of his life. Let us hope that he spent them happily. He did not live long after his arrival here. In the Charleston Morning Post and Daily Advertiser of Saturday, December 30, 1786, there is the following notice of his death:

"Yesterday died, JOSEPH SALVADORE, Esq; aged 86 years. He was formerly a most eminent merchant in England, being one of those who furnished that Government with a million of money in two hours' notice, during the rebellion in the year 1745; and likewise was one of the greatest landholders in this country."

Joseph Salvador is buried in the old Da Costa burial ground at Hanover street. He rests next to his friend, Isaac Da Costa. Here is all that is left of the inscription on his tombstone, the dashes showing where the edges of the slab are broken:

—cred to the memory o—
Isurune Rodrigues other—
—oseph Salvadore of Coron—
Fort 96 in the Province of
Carolina and late of Tooting
in the Kingdom of Grate B—
he was one of the Elders—
of the Portugeuse Jewish—
He likewise was F. R. S.—
Governer of several Hos—
He was a respectable—
bearing misfortunes with—
& resignation to the will of—
Almighty God trusting in h—
Departed this transitory lif—
Eve of Sabath 8 of—
5547 which answers—
of December 1786—
May his soul enj—

Thus died this "representative of generosity, kindliness and courtliness," as Pic-

ciotto calls him. His will made on October 7, 1782, whilst he is still in London, is recorded here in the Probate Court (Wills 1786-1793.) He bequeathes all his real estate in Great Britain or elsewhere, together with his plantations, etc, in South Carolina, to his daughters, Abigail Salvador, Elisebah Salvador, Sosannah, otherwise Susannah Salvador and William Stephens, of London, packer. In addition he gives £1,000 to each of the above named daughters. He leaves £100 in trust to William Stephens to be paid to such person or persons as his daughter, Judith Mendes Da Costa Salvador, wife of Mr Joshua Mendes Da Costa, shall appoint by note or writing, or in default of such direction, to herself for her own and separate use. He also leaves to her an annuity of £50 a year. He leaves to Sarah Salvador, widow of Francis Salvador, Esq, £10 and £100 to William Stephens. To his grandson, Jacob Salvador, he leaves £100, when he becomes 21 and to his granddaughters, who may be living at the time of his decease, £200. He leaves £100 to the Portuguese Jews' Synagogue of the city of London. The residuary estate is to go to his daughters.

In a codicil made at Charleston on November 11, 1786, he adds "his worthy friend Joseph Da Costa" to the list of his executors." He leaves to him in trust £100 sterling "to pay the same to the Portuguese Congregation in the City of Charleston, known by the name of Beth Elohim Unveh Shallom, or the House of the Lord and Mansion of Peace," and to Mr Gershon Cohen £20 sterling for the German Jewish Congregation in the City of Charleston, known by the name of Beth Elohim, or House of the Lord. I believe that there is a mistake here and I shall refer to it again in my next article. To

his clerk, Michael Hart, he leaves £100 sterling.

There is another codicil added on December 27, 1786. Joseph Salvador is on his death bed. He cannot sign his name any more, but makes his mark. It reads as follows: "Fifty pounds more to Mr Michael Hart, my clerk; twenty-five pounds to Mrs Jane Davis; twenty pounds to Mr Charles Brown and a hundred pound to Mrs Sary Da Costa, widow."

The subsequent history of the Salvador estate, is somewhat uncertain. Pieciotto's story of the American's visit to Mrs Texeira De Matros is probably apocryphal. It is strange that Joseph Salvador does not mention her in his will. The story is highly improbable for reasons that are self-evident. We know, however, that there was considerable litigation in after years about those lands, which have always been known as "the Jews' lands." It is impossible to ascertain the details today, for the records of Abbeville County, in which Ninety Sixty was formerly situated, were burnt many years ago. The late Judge McGowan had a good deal to say on the subject in an article which, I believe, he printed in The News and Courier, but I have not the reference at hand.

Thus ends the singular story of the chequered career of a noble philanthropist. We are proud to perpetuate his memory and proud to think that his ashes now mingle with those of our own beloved dead.

[Reprinted from The News and Courier.]

THE DAGGETT PRTG CO CHASN. S. C.

THE JEWS OF SOUTH CAROLINA

RECORD OF FIRST NATURALIZATION IN THE PROVINCE.

Dr Elzas Makes Some Interesting Discoveries in the State House in Columbia--The Text of the Act of 1697 "for the Making Aliens Free ***and for Granting Liberty of Conscience to all Protestants."

[Reprinted from the News and Courier.]

At the request of The News and Courier to take a trip to Columbia and "have a look," I paid a flying trip to the State Capital this week in search of more records of the past.

Early on Monday morning I wended my way to the Secretary of State's office, where the treasures are to be found in richest profusion. I found my friend, Gantt, at his post and he at once placed himself at my disposal. It was but a few minutes before I felt that I owned the State House. As my time was limited I soon had all hands at work.

An ordinary official would have put me down as a very exacting visitor. Not so the genial Gantt, however, who is himself quite an enthusiast on historical matters. He knows exactly what he has and where to find it, and his amiable assistance to me during my short stay will be ever remembered.

I must cut my story short this time, but will say that I did not find what I was looking for--and I now understand why--but I found something else of the utmost value in determining a number of hitherto doubtful points with reference to the early story of the Jews of South Carolina. I shall next week publish these documents in full.

I found numerous small items of interest. Two land grants to Moses Lindo, e. g., of which there are no records in Charleston. I found mention of a Jewish physician in Charleston in 1772, and various miscellaneous matters that I have added to my note book.

There was one document that I was very pleased to discover, particularly because one would least expect to find it where it is. It occurs in the volume: "Grants, Sales etc," D. 1703-1709. It is the first record of the naturalization of a Jew in South Carolina and is dated 1697. It is made out in the name of Simon Valentine. We have met this Simon Valentine before. My readers will remember him as one of the Jews whom we found in Charleston prior to 1700. He was a merchant, evidently of means, and figures in numerous transactions in the records. We found him several times as surety on administration bonds. The document is exceedingly interesting and I copy it in full:

CAROLINA

The Rt Honble Joseph Blake Esqr, one of the true and absolute Lds, and Proprietors of the Province of Carolina, Commandr in Chief vice Admiral and Governor of South Carolina:

To all Judges Justices Magistrates ministers and officers Ecclesiastical and Civil and to all psons whatsoever to whome this shall come to be seen, heard, read or known

GREETEING

KNOW Yee that Simon Valentine Mercht; an alien of ye Jewish Nation borne out of the Crown of England hath taken his oath of Allegiance to our Sovereigne Lord William ye Third over England Scotland France and Ireland King &c Defender of ye faith and hath done every other thing wch by an act of as-

sembly made at Charles Town in ye ninth Yeare of ye Reigne of our Sovereign Lord King Willm, &c, Anno Dom: One Thousd Six hundred ninety Six and Seven entitled an Act to make alien free of this pte of the Province and for granting Liberty of Conscience to all Protestants as one is required to do And is fully and effectually to all Intents Constructions and Purposes Qualified and Capacitated to have use and Enjoy all the rights Privileges Powers and Immunities Given or Intended to bee given to any Alien then Inhabitant of South Carolina by the aforesd Act to Certifie wch I have hereunto Sett my hand and Caused the Publick Seale to be affixed at Charles Town the Twenty Sixth day of May Anno Dom. one Thousd six hundred ninety and seaven

JOSEPH BLAKE.

There is a very interesting thing to be noticed in connection with the Act under which Simon Valentine is naturalized. The original Act is not now in existence, but a copy of it is to be found in Trott's "Laws of Carolina," p. 61. I copy the parts of interest to our inquiry.

An Act for the Making Aliens Free of this Part of this Province, and for Granting Liberty of Conscience to all Protestants.

WHEREAS Prosecution for Religion hath forced some Aliens, and trade and the fertility of this Colony has encouraged others to resort to this Colony, all which have given good testimony of their humble duty and loyalty to his Majesty and the Crown of England, and of their fidelity to the true and absolute Lords and Proprietors of this Province, and of their obedience to their Laws, and their good affections to the inhabitants thereof, and by their industry, diligence and trade have very much enriched and advanced this Colony and Settlement thereof:

I. BE IT ENACTED * * * That all Aliens, male and female, of what nation soever, which now are inhabitants of South Carolina, their wives and children, shall have, use and enjoy all the rights, privileges, powers and immunities whatsoever, which any person may, can, might, could, or of right ought to have, use and enjoy; and they shall be from henceforth adjudged, reputed and taken to be in every condition, respect and degree, as free to all intents, purposes and constructions, as if they had been and were born of English parents within this Province. * * *

VI. AND WHEREAS several of the present inhabitants of this country, did transport themselves into this Province, in hopes of enjoying the liberty of their consciences according to their own perswasion, which the Royal King Charles the Second, of blessed memory, in his gracious charter was pleased to impower the Lords Proprietors of this Province to grant to the inhabitants of this Province for to encourage the settlement of the same, BE IT THEREFORE ENACTED by the authority aforesaid, That all Christians which now are, or hereafter may be in this Province (Papists only excepted) shall enjoy the full, free and undisturbed liberty of their consciences, so as to be in the exercise of their worship according to the professed rules of their religion, without any lett, molestation or hindrance by any power either ecclesiastical or civil whatsoever. ALWAYS PROVIDED, That they do not disturb the publick peace of this Province, nor disturb any other in the time of their worship.

Read three times and ratified in open Assembly, March 10, 1696-7.

The interesting fact in connection with this Act is, that 63 names are mentioned therein and amongst them are 3 Jews: Simon Vallentine, merchant; Jacob Mendis, merchant, and Avila, merchant. Another name ——, merchant, is obliterated in the original.

(See also Statutes of South Carolina, Vol I, pp. 131-133.)

South Carolina may well be proud of this record of her early tolerance. It is unique in the history of the British Colonies.

Barnett A. Elzas.

OLD JEWISH CEMETERIES.

WHERE THE EARLY SETTLERS INTERRED THEIR DEAD.

Dr Barnett A. Elzas Investigates a Traditional Jewish Burial Ground on Archdale Street, but Finds More Hibernians than Hebrews—The Story of a Long-Forgotten Cemetery on Hanover Street.

One of the most notable traits in the character of the Jew, is his almost sublime devotion to his dead. This tender feeling for his departed loved ones has always existed and the Jew is significantly taught in his sacred writings that the highest form of "loving-kindness"—the ideal, indeed, of loving-kindness, is that shown to the dead; for, as the rabbis well point out, it is a manifestation of unselfish love, inasmuch as it can seek no return. No matter where the Jew is scattered and dispersed, his first care is to acquire a burying place for his dead. Hence it is that we often find a Jewish cemetery before an organized synagogue or congregation exists. As a general rule, wherever a handful of Jews are found there will also be found a synagogue for worship, a school for the education of the young, and a burial-ground for the dead.

The communal history of K. K. Beth Elohim of Charleston dates back to 1750, but I am satisfied that several years at least before this date the Jews of Charleston met regularly for public worship.

In my investigation into the history of this community I was puzzled to know where the old settlers who had died here—and I know of many—were laid to rest. The oldest tombstone we have is that of the Right Rev Moses Cohen, D. D., the first Chief Rabbi of the congregation, in the Coming Street Cemetery, and bears the date 1762. As I just observed, many Jews died here before that time. Where were they interred?

After diligent inquiry I was told that there was an old burial-ground in Archdale street, which tradition said belonged to the Jews. I went on a tour of investigation to the place indicated and only after several visits did I one day find the large gate open, so that I could gain ac-

cess. I was already enjoying the anticipated delight of making a find. But, alas, for the vanity of an antiquarian's hopes. The graveyard was full of O'Hooligans, O'Briens, O'Shaughnessys and O'Flynns and I came away convinced that I had made a mistake. "When you are investigating," I said to myself, "investigate for yourself and don't believe all that people tell you, or you will often be fooled." I have several times since experienced the profound truth of this graveyard meditation.

I was as far from solving the mystery as I was before, but subsequent reflection made the matter clear to me. I had visited an old plantation not long ago and had noticed a plot railed off, which was the family burial-ground. "Might not the Jews likewise have had their private burial-grounds in olden times?" I thought. I know now that there were several such in Charleston. The Tobias family e. g. buried their dead on their plantation at Hobcaw, near Mount Pleasant, but this has long since been turned into a ploughed field. Our oldest cemetery at Coming street, we are told in the deed, was originally purchased in 1754 by Isaac Da Costa, "For a private burying-place for his own family." Then there is the Hanover street ground, which Isaac Da Costa afterwards purchased in place of the former, for the same purpose. This brings me to the subject of my article.

I was fortunate enough not long ago to find a copy of the old Constitution of K. K. Beth Elohim of 1820 in New York. There is none here, and as I could not obtain the original I had a transcript made of it. It is a most interesting document, and I shall have a good deal to say of it at some future time. Rule IX of that Constitution reads as follows:

"There shall be One Congregational Burial Ground only, wherein all the deceased members of this Congregation shall be interred, provided, that this law shall not extend to any family place of interment already established; namely, that of the Tobias family, in which no other than that family and its nearest relatives may be interred with the honors of this Congregation. * * *

This law considers the Burial Ground, heretofore called the Da Costa's, to be properly belonging to the family of Isaac Da Costa, sen., deceased, into which his

near relatives are permitted to be interred and no other person, not even such persons as have relations already deposited there; provided nothing in this law shall extend to the exclusion of Mr Emanuel De La Motta, his wife and children." * * *

We know the Da Costa ground, which is still used, but where was the "place of interment of the Tobias family?" I don't know. The Tobias family doesn't know. The oldest member of K. K. Beth Elohim doesn't know. Here comes the next link in the puzzle.

I was examining an old Charleston directory of a little earlier date than the constitution to which I referred. I was struck by the following items:

HEBREW BURIAL GROUND (PUBLIC) COMING ST.

HEBREW BURIAL GROUND (PRIVATE) 2. HANOVER ST.

Was this a printer's mistake? Likely enough, seeing that there were many typographical errors in the book. Or were there really two burial grounds on Hanover street? Was the other one that of the Tobias family, long forgotten? For some days I was too busy to find out, but the thing worried me and at last I went to look for myself. It was no easy matter to discover what I was looking for, but at last, at the end of a small lot hidden from view from the street, I saw tombstones, and after climbing over a dilapidated brick wall I found myself in reality in an old eighteenth century private Jewish Burial Ground! Here are the inscriptions of the tombstones:

In Memory of—Samuel Levy—of Camden—who departed this life—June 20th, 1799—aged 13 years.

In Memory of—Abraham S. Abraham—son of Samuel Abraham—who departed this life—on Edisto Island—September the 26th 1809—aged 20 years one month and 15 days.

To the—Memory—of—Mr Henry Moses—who departed this life on Monday the —11th February 1814—In the 68th year of his age.

Sacred—to the—Memory—of—Mrs Elizabeth Moses—who departed this life on the —19th day of January 1819—in the 75th year of her age.

Sacred—to the Memory of—Mrs Miriam Hyams—wife of—Samuel Hyams—and daughter of—Eleazer and Judith Levy—Born in Charleston So. Ca. in the—year

1780 and a resident there—until her death on the—19 of January 1821 * * *

In memory of—Eliza Henrietta Levy—the infant daughter of Chapman and Flora Levy—who departed this life—the 7th day of March 1822—aged 1 year and 17 days.

Rosalie Lambert—third daughter of William and Rachel Lamnert died 30th Aug. 1835 (child.)

Marion J. Tobias died 19th July 1836 (child.)

Sacred—to the Memory—of—Henry J Harby Sen.—Born 12th October 1793—died 14th September 1841. (?)

Charles Ferdinand Smith—Son of Thomas and Everleen Smith (infant) d. July 1849.

Henry J. Harby Junr—Born 1843 d. 1852.

Sacred—to the Memory of—My mother—Rebecca Harby—Born 2d Oct 1798—died 31st Dec 1854—aged 87 years 2 months 29 days.

Sacred—to the memory of—Catherine Frances—wife of C. F. Whippey—died 5th Nov 1858.

Isaac Tobias—Born Feb 10th 1796—died Jan 28th 1860.

Tobias Harby—born Sept 22nd 1836—died April 17th 1860.

Sophie Tobias—died Feb 13, 1866 (child.)

Sacred—to the Memory of—Miss Caroline D'L. Harby—Born May 4th 1801—Died Jan 6th 1876.

I thought that I had solved the mystery of the Tobias burial ground, but no one to whom I spoke of the matter could give me any information about it. With the kind assistance of my friend, Mr Henry De Saussure, I searched the title and found that this cemetery was conveyed in 1798 by Betzje Henrickson to Henry Moses, Solomon Moses, Meyer Derkheim, Samuel Hyams, Benjamin Tores and Solomon Harby in trust "as a burying ground and place of interment for the said * * * and their descendants, and also such other person and persons professing Judaism, as the Trustees for the time being or a majority of them shall for that purpose approve of."

Strange it is, however, that the constitution of 1820, should not have referred to this ground and still stranger is it that none of the old members of Beth Elohim should know anything about a Jewish burial ground that has been used as late as 1876.

Barnett A. Elzas.

[Reprinted from The News and Courier.]

CONSTITUTION

OF THE

HEBREW CONGREGATION

OF

KAAL KADOSH

BETH-ELOHIM,

OR

HOUSE OF GOD

CHARLESTON, (S. C.)

M,DCCCXX.

Reprinted by Dr. Barnett A. Elzas.
Rabbi of K. K. Bethelohim.
1904.

CONSTITUTION

OF THE

HEBREW CONGREGATION

OF

KAAL KADOSH

BETH-ELOHIM,

OR

HOUSE OF GOD.

CHARLESTON, (S. C.)

M.DCCCXX.

Reprinted by Dr. Barnett A. Elzas.
Rabbi of K. K. Bethelohim.
1904.

PREFACE.

The following Constitution of the Congregation Beth Elohim, dated 1820, is a most interesting document to the student of the development of Judaism in America. It gives a very good picture of what Judaism was in America at the time of the birth of the Reform movement. It is, I believe, the oldest printed Constitution in America with the exception of one of the Congregation Shearith Israel of New York, which is dated 1805. It is reprinted from what is, as far as I have been able to ascertain, a unique copy. To J. Quintus Cohen, Esq., of New York, who owns this copy, my best thanks are expressed for the transcript, which I have carefully compared with the original before reprinting.

BARNETT A. ELZAS.

Charleston, S. C., January, 1904.

PREAMBLE.

WHEREAS, it becomes no less proper than necessary, that all human institutions, and legal provisions for the government of men, when united into societies, should receive such additions, and undergo such alterations and improvements, as important changes and local circumstances may require: No less so, though with greater caution, as regards those regulations that are formed and established for upholding and maintaining the sacred principles of RELIGION!—for promoting HARMONY and social love among the worshippers of the Almighty Ruler of the World—for perpetuating the due exercise of those rites and ceremonies which characterize and will, it is hoped, immortalize JUDAISM!

These having been the solemn convictions of all the Yachidim of Kaal Kadosh Beth-Elohim, they, at a general meeting, constituted twenty-five members, elected from their whole body, to act, under certain modifications, as their LEGAL REPRESENTATIVES; and invested them with full authority to frame for this Hebrew Congregation, a new Constitution. Proceeding, therefore, under such authority, this body, henceforth to be recognized as the only GENERAL ADJUNTA, with due regard to the sacredness of the trust reposed in us, by our Constituents, convened from time to time, for the purpose of executing the great object contemplated; and, after much mature deliberation and discussion, agreed to, and adopted the following Laws, as the Constitution of the Hebrew Congregation of Charleston, South Carolina.

ABRAHAM ALEXANDER,	SOLOMON HYAMS,
MARKS LAZARUS,	LYON MOSES,
EMANUEL DE LA MOTTA,	ISAIAH MOSES,
MYER MOSES,	MOSES COHEN,
SIMON LEVY,	H. M. HURTZ,
JACOB DE LEON,	ISAAC LYONS,
NATHAN HART,	DAVID CARDOZA,
MOSES C. LEVY,	SIMON MAIRS,
PHILIP COHEN,	JACOB LAZARUS,
AARON MOISE,	HYAM HARRIS,
SAMUEL SIMONS,	S. M. HART,
LYON LEVY,	JOSEPH JOSEPH,

ABRAHAM LIPMAN.

RULE I.

That this congregation be known and continued by the name of Kaal Kadosh Beth-Elohim, or House of God; according to the Minhag Sephardim, as heretofore practised in this city.

RULE II.

The fundamental power of this Congregation shall be vested in a General Adjunta, to consist of twenty-five Yachidim, now in office, or such as shall be in office, at the adoption of this Constitution, who shall continue for three years; and, together with the Parnassim and the Private adjunta, hereafter named, shall have the sole management of all the functions formerly exercised by the people at large; and if any vacancy shall happen in this body, by death, resignation, election to Private Adjunta, or any other occurrence, the remainder of that body, or a quorum, to consist of at least fifteen members, shall within ten days fill up such vacancy from among the Yachidim at large, for the unexpired term of such member, who may die, resign, be elected to Private Adjunta, or any other circumstances that may occur to create such vacancy.

RULE III.

On the first Sunday in Elul, the General Adjunta shall convene, and when a quorum, as aforesaid, is present, they shall commence the general election. They shall elect from among themselves, or the Yachidim at large, seven members for a Private Adjunta, out of which number shall be chosen, by ballot, a Parnass Presidenta, a Parnass Residenta, and a Gaboy to serve for one year, from the ensuing Rosanna. The Parnass Presidenta to preside for the first six months from his entrance into office and the Parnass Residenta to preside the remaining six months; and if any vacancy shall occur, in consequence of electing persons out of their own body, the same shall be filled up as before directed, or immediately thereafter, if thought expedient.

And on the first Sunday in Elul, every fourth year the said General Adjunta, in conjunction with the Private Adjunta, shall also be convened by the Parnass Presidenta, or the presiding officer, as before directed; and, when a quorum, consisting of at least fourteen members of the Public and four of the Private Adjunta, are present, they shall, previously to going into the election of a Private Adjunta, elect from among their own body, not more than eighteen persons, or as many as are willing to stand for the next three years, and from among the Yachidim at large, seven members, to form a new body; after which they shall elect the Private Adjunta, Parnassim and Gaboy, for one year; and if any vacancy shall happen, in consequence of a refusal of any members to serve, the same shall be filled up as before directed, or immediately if thought necessary; so that the General Adjunta be at all times full and complete.

RULE IV.

All members of the Congregation shall be obliged to subscribe at least eleven dollars annually.

All Ladies seats in the Synagogue shall be vacated; and, after being classed and assessed by a committee, shall be sold at public auction for the benefit of the Congregation. Such seats shall be held for three years, and the same proceedings for the Ladies seats, shall be repeated every succeeding three years. Each subscribing member in this Congregation shall be compelled to purchase a seat for his wife, under the penalty of being deprived of his rights and privileges, and when the said sale of seats takes place, the pre-emption money shall then be paid.

The Committee to be appointed for the purpose of classing and assessing the seats, and making arrangements for their disposal, shall consist of nine persons, to wit: two from the Private Adjunta, three from the Public Adjunta, and four from the Yachidim at large; five of whom shall form a quorum.

Any subscriber may purchase one or more seats: provided he declares immediately as they are cried off to him the name of the person for whom he purchased: which may be permitted, provided the persons to occupy them are his wife, sisters, aunts or other relations, who

are subscribing members, and those persons residents, or intending to become residents of this city. The wives or daughters of non-subscribers can not be permitted to have seats purchased for them by any person whatsoever.

RULE V.

The General Adjunta, together with the Parnassim and Private Adjunta, shall, from time to time, and at all times, when necessary, be authorized to elect the Hazan, Shamass, Shocker, Shamas, Secretary Hatantora, Hatan Bereisheth Gaboy of Kaaren Rayematt, Parnass of Beth-Hiaoy, the Trustees and every other officer requisite for this Congregation, from among their body; or from among the people generally; but no officer, unless elected from the Private Adjunta, Hazan, Shocker, Shamass or Secretary, shall be considered as creating a vacancy in the General Adjunta. All officers under pay, with the exception of Hazan, shall undergo an annual election.

RULE VI.

The Parnass Presidenta shall have the sole direction in the synagogue, during divine service, and all officers under pay shall be under his control. He shall preside at all public meetings (excepting cases of appeal.) He shall inspect the Gaboy's accounts, whenever he thinks proper so to do, and may order the same to be laid before the Private or Public Adjunta, as often as information is required respecting the finances. He shall be authorized to call before the Private Adjunta any person or persons, who may misbehave either in Synagogue, its enclosures during divine service, or other legal occasions of meeting, and moreover shall make it his indispensable duty to support, protect, and defend this Constitution, and call any one to account who shall violate the same. He shall be bound to convene the Private Adjunta at least once every month, and call extra meetings whenever necessary for the interest of the Congregation; and he may also, with the consent of the Private Adjunta, convene the General Adjunta as often as may be proper, and expedient for the benefit of this Congregation.

RULE VII.

The Private and Public Adjunta, at their first meeting, shall make a solemn declaration, to be entered on record by the Secretary, that they will in good conscience, adjudge all cases brought before them, without fear, favor or affection: and otherwise will faithfully discharge the several duties of their station, to the extent of their abilities and best judgment. They shall have the disposal of all vacant seats in the Synagogue; be empowered to make all by-laws, and alter and amend the same, for the government of all officers and every other person under the pay of the Congregation; and such other by-laws as may be found necessary, and which being first carried before the General Adjunta, and approved by them, shall be considered of full force and binding.

The said Private Adjunta may suspend officers under pay until their trial or appeal is finally decided, and acquit all offenders inclusive or exclusive of the disabilities laid down in this Constitution. They may, at their discretion, inflict a fine not exceeding twenty dollars.

And, if any new and unforseen case shall arise and come before them, for which this Constitution does not expressly provide, they shall be empowered to investigate the same, according to their best judgment and discretion, and if necessary for the good example and advantage of this Congregation, the said Private Adjunta shall place the offenders under disabilities, and inflict a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars; and all persons whatsoever coming under the penalty of the laws, shall absolutely be deprived of their honors, rights and privileges, in and out of Synagogue, until he, she or they comply with the fine, disabilities, or otherwise be reconciled to the Congregation. Provided, that no persons shall be deprived of the right of appeal, nor remain under the punishment of the law, until such appeal is decided. All appeals must be made to the Parnass Presidenta, in writing, within three days; and within eight days, or sooner if convenient to the Parnass, the General Adjunta shall be convened by him, when the merits of the case shall be investigated; the same shall then be decided, and when so decided, shall

be considered conclusive, and finally binding on all parties.

In all cases of appeal from the decision of the Private Adjunta, the General Adjunta, then constituting a Court of Appeals, shall have power to reject or confirm the decision of the Private Adjunta, or, if they think meet may mitigate or increase the punishment by amercement; provided in no case, the fine determined on by the Court of Appeals, shall exceed double the amount of the sum inflicted by the Private Adjunta.

RULE VIII.

No person or persons shall be sanctioned to combine for the purpose of erecting any other Synagogue or for uniting in any other unlawful Minyan, within five miles of Charleston; nor shall any person or persons, under the jurisdiction of this Congregation, be permitted, under any pretence whatever to aid, join, or assist at any such unlawful Minyan or Combination.

All strangers arriving here, who do not, after the lapse of time affixed by the Constitution, become members of the Congregation, shall be liable to all the penalties and restrictions that members are subject to, and shall not be admitted members, until such restrictions are removed. And if any person under the jurisdiction of this Congregation, be guilty of such an atrocious offence, as either to be concerned, aid, or assist as aforesaid, he shall, on sufficient proof thereof before the Private Adjunta, forfeit all his rights and privileges in this Congregation, and be subject to a fine not exceeding two hundred dollars; and such offender or offenders shall never be reinstated into his or their rights and privileges, and moreover be deprived the right of burial inside of the Beth Hiam, until he or they by themselves, executors, or administrators, relations or friends, pay up and settle the fine that may be inflicted. And any person or persons placing themselves into such predicament, shall incur the penalty, inasmuch as the same, either in joy or in sorrow, shall extend to the whole family under his or their control and jurisdiction.

RULE IX.

There shall be one Congregational Burial Ground only, wherein all the deceased members of this Congregation

shall be interred, provided that this law shall not extend to any family place of interment already established; namely, that of the Tobias family, in which no other than that family, and its nearest relations may be interred with the honors of this Congregation.

Any person or persons persisting to act contrary to the intention of this law, shall be deprived the officers of the Congregation; nor shall the Hazan attend on the occasion.

This law considers the Burial Ground, heretofore called the Da Costa's, to be properly belonging to the family of Isaac Da Costa, sen deceased, in [illegible] his near relations are permitted to be interred and no other person, not even such persons as have actually deposited there; provided nothing in this law shall extend to the exclusion of Mr. Emanuel De La Motta, his wife and children. And, any person or persons having charge of the foregoing Burial Grounds who shall permit or suffer any person to be buried, who is a defaulter, or rejected by this Congregation, he, she or they so offending, shall be subject to a fine in a sum not less than two hundred, and not exceeding five hundred dollars, without the right of any appeal whatsoever.

RULE X.

All officers under pay of this Congregation, shall receive such compensation as the General Adjunta shall think proper to allow, consistent with the funds and circumstances of the Congregation. The Private Adjunta shall not make any loan, contract, or incur expenses amounting to any sum exceeding one hundred dollars for one specific object, without first submitting the same to the General Adjunta for their concurrence.

RULE XI.

On or about a fortnight before Rosanna in every year, the Gaboy shall attend, according to the practice heretofore, at some convenient place at the Synagogue or its inclosures, to receive payment for seats subscribed for, and open the subscription list for the ensuing year, when every yachid of this Congregation shall attend and subscribe any sum not less than eleven dollars (exclusive of the amount of his wife's or family's seats)

for the support of this Congregation; for which arrangement offerings shall be permitted in the Synagogue, not less than six pence each, excepting Rosanah, Kipur, and other Holy days; when each offering shall not be less than one shilling, which, at the end of every year, shall be deducted from such subscription and assessment of seats; and if any yachid shall refuse or neglect to subscribe and furnish himself with a seat, and settle all his arrears previous to Rosanah, he shall forfeit such seat in the Synagogue, and be deprived of every rights, honors or privileges, and buried inside the Beth Hiam, until such arrears are settled; and, if any yachid shall dishonorably refuse to contribute as aforesaid, and afterwards come forward within three months from Rosanah to settle, so as to regain another seat in Synagogue, together with his honors and rights, such person or persons shall be charged five dollars for every month in addition, as long as he, she or they shall have withheld their support from the Congregation, and should he, she or they die, under such delinquence, he, she or they shall be deprived of burial inside the Beth Hiam, until all arrears are settled.

RULE XII.

All Israelites now in Charleston, who are not Yachidim, and such as may arrive hereafter, after one years residence shall be bound to subscribe to the subscription list, and provide themselves and wives (if any) with seats as aforesaid, which shall confer on them all the honors and privileges in and out of Synagogue, in joy or sorrow; but neither such as are in this situation at the adoption of this Constitution, nor such as shall hereafter arrive in the country, shall be admitted Yachidim of this Congregation, or become eligible to any office of honor, until after a residence of two years, when such persons shall apply in writing to the Public Adjunta, to become Yachidim, and if approved of and admitted by them, on paying twenty dollars, and not otherwise, shall such person or persons become Yachidim of this Congregation; it is, however, to be understood that sons of Yachidim shall, if admitted, pay ten dollars. This law embraces all persons indiscriminately above twenty-one years of age, under an obliga-

tion, as before stated, to give their support towards this Congregation.

RULE XIII.

No person being called to the Sephar, having Portos-lfechal, or going up there to offer, shall leave the same, without offering at least one shilling for the Parnass Presidenta, and prosperity of the Congregation, nor shall any ridiculous or unusual offering be permitted.

Any person offending in either of these cases, shall be called before the Private Adjunta, and at their discretion fined, or dealt with according to the nature and aggravation of the offence, and shall continue under all disabilities in and out of Synagogue, until such decision is complied with.

RULE XIV.

Should any law of this Constitution prove detrimental to the interest of this Congregation, or require an alteration; or, if any new law be found necessary, the Parnassim and Adjunta, shall have power to call, or by a petition of two-thirds of all the subscribing Yachidim, exclusive of the members of Public or Private Adjunta, the General Adjunta in conjunction with the Private Adjunta, who shall convene to take into consideration, such alteration, amendment, or new law; twenty of whom shall form a quorum, and being adopted by two-thirds of them, and not otherwise, shall become binding and of full force in this Congregation.

RULE XV.

The Institution of Kaaren Kayematt is hereby acknowledged and made sacred, agreeably to the written contracts heretofore existing between the same and this Congregation, for the benefit of said Institution.

Offerings shall be permitted in the Synagogue, and the Gaboy thereof shall be entitled to a seat in the Banea. The Parnassim and Gaboy shall not be eligible to the situation of Gaboy of Kaaren Kayematt.

RULE XVI.

The powers vested in the Trustees, as recorded on the 11th December, 1791, are hereby acknowledged and

made sacred: and if any vacancy shall occur, either by death, resignation or otherwise, the same shall be filled up after three weeks notice, but no one shall be eligible to the office of Trustee, unless he is a Yachid of this Congregation, and a resident of this city.

RULE XVII.

Any person, who from poverty or other misfortune, shall make it appear to the Private Adjunta, that he is utterly incapable (without manifest injury to himself or family) to settle and pay off his arrears before Rossanna; they shall be authorized to take his note for the amount due; thereupon he shall be permitted to subscribe for the next year, and retain his seat, and the honors of the Congregation; and, as soon as said Private Adjunta, or their successors shall be satisfied, that the condition of such person or persons is altered, so as to enable him or them to pay and settle such arrears, it shall be their duty to call for the whole or part of such arrears; and if after one month's notice, he or they shall refuse to settle, the Gaboy is hereby authorized and empowered to put the same in suit, and the delinquents shall remain deprived of all their rights, honors, and privileges, until such arrears are paid or satisfied; but in no case whatsoever, unless a person pleads poverty to the Adjunta, shall notes or bonds be taken for any arrears due the Congregation.

RULE XVIII.

Any person having a marriage in his family, a Son Minyan, or making years for his parents, a birth, or his wife going out of her lying-in, or other occasions of joy and sorrow, such person or persons, on making the same known in proper time, either in writing or personally to the Parnass Presidenta, shall be entitled to demand, and shall receive all the customary honors and rights in the Synagogue, provided on no such occasion, shall the Parnass Presidenta be bound to permit an escoba, or call the person to the Sephar, on the day of Rossanna, Kipur, or Hossanna Raba, unless he thinks proper to do so; and if the Parnass Presidenta, after due and reasonable notice, shall neglect or deprive any

person or persons of their rights and honors granted to them under this law, he shall be amenable for the same, on complaint to the Private Adjunta, and be liable to a fine not less than five, and not exceeding twenty dollars.

RULE XIX.

All Mishberachs shall be permitted in the Hebrew or Spanish language, optional to the party so offering, and all the Mizvots be given out in the Hebrew and no other language; and all notices in the Synagogue shall be proclaimed in English; and such parts of the *Hannoten Tashua as was usually said in English, be continued in the same manner.

RULE XX.

On every Kipur night perpetually, the first escoba shall be made for the Reverend Moses Cohen, deceased, because he was appointed and confirmed the Reverend Doctor of this Congregation, from its first establishment, and as such it is conceived every mark of respect is due to his memory. That the second escoba be made for Rabbi Moses Eleizar, because he was a learned man in the laws of God, and until his death had taught the youth of this Congregation, and manifested unremitted zeal to promote religion in this country. That the third escoba be made for Mr. Philip Hart; and the fourth for Mr. Gushon Cohen; the fifth for Mr. Israel Joseph; the sixth for the Reverend Abraham Azuby, who died the Hazan of this Congregation, highly respected and lamented for the purity of his life, and strict attention to his clerical duties; that the seventh be made for Mr. Abraham Alexander, sen. deceased, who volunteered his services to perform divine service; and that the eighth be made for the Reverend Emanuel Nunes Carvalho, deceased, who had been an acknowledged Hazan of this Congregation for several years, and died much respected and lamented by a large circle of friends and congregators, among whom he resided. And further, that any person desirous of having an escoba for any of his relatives or friends, shall pay for every list not exceeding six names, thirteen dollars; and for every one exceeding six, two dollars additional, for the benefit of the Zedaka, which list and money must be presented to the Hazan

at least three days previous to Kipur: and that no person be permitted to offer to the foregoing escobas less than one dollar and the name of the person so intending to offer alike to be furnished to the Hazan at least three days previous to Kipur: and moreover, any Hazan of this Congregation dying while in office, shall be entitled to an escoba perpetually.

RULE XXI.

Any person not being under the disabilities of this Constitution, who had made, or hereafter shall make a gift or devise to this Congregation, the Hebra or the Kauren Kayemarr, any present valued by the Private Adjunta at sixty dollars, shall be entitled to a Public Misbberach during life, and after his decease an escoba on every Kipur night perpetually, but after the first Kipur no escoba shall be made for any person leaving a bequest, until the legacy be paid into the hands of the Gabay

RULE XXII.

The Anniversary of the Consecration of the Synagogue shall be commemorated perpetually by this Congregation, on the Sabbath previous to Rossanna, when there will be made a public escoba for Messrs. Israel Joseph and Philip Hart, as the principal benefactors in promoting the building of the Synagogue, also a public escoba for Mr. Gashon Cohen, for his unremitted zeal and exertions, in superintending the building until its completion: and also, for Mr. Jacob Cohen, who was essentially serviceable, in like manner: and that a Public Misberach during life, and after death an escoba be made for Mr. Lyon Moses for making a donation of a set of brass chandeliers in behalf of himself and family, and that one General Mishberach be made for all persons, who contributed towards this pious undertaking.

RULE XXIII.

This Congregation will not encourage or interfere with making proselytes under any pretence whatever, nor shall any such be admitted under the jurisdiction of this Congregation, until he, she, or they produce legal and satisfactory credentials, from some other Congregation.

where a regular Chief, or Rabbi and Hebrew Consistory is established; and, provided, he, she, or they, are not people of colour.

RULE XXIV.

Any person or persons being married contrary to the Mosaical Law, or renouncing his or their religion, shall themselves and their issue, never be recognized members of this Congregation; and should such person or persons die, they shall not be buried within the walls of the Beth-Hiam, unless he, she, or they shall have reformed, at least one year previous to his or their death, and undergone such penance as is prescribed by the laws of our Holy religion.

Nor shall any person, desirous of consummating a marriage with any female who has lived as a prostitute, or kept a disorderly house, be permitted such marriage under the sanction of this Congregation, but should such person or persons so marry without its jurisdiction, and after having lived some years, a moral and decent life, he or they, shall be entitled to the same right of becoming Yachidim as all strangers arriving in this city.

RULE XXV.

Any person or persons publicly violating the Sabbath, or other sacred days, shall be deprived of every privilege of Synagogue and the services of its officers. He or they shall also be subject to such fine and penalties as the Parnassim and Adjunta may deem fit, nor shall he or they be re-admitted to the privileges aforesaid, until he or they shall have paid the fine and suffered the punishment to be inflicted under this law.

RULE XXVI.

All strangers, after residing in this city the time affixed by law, and all persons residing out of its limits, should they require the honors and privileges of this Congregation, such as the consummation of marriage, or other joyful occasions, or burial for any corpse, not belonging to this Congregation, they shall not be granted such request, unless the applicants pay into the hands of the Gaboy, a sum not less than fifteen, and not exceeding two hundred dollars of which the Parnassim

and Private Adjunta shall be sole judges, and their decision shall be binding, without any appeal whatsoever.

RULE XXVII.

All bonds and specialties belonging to this Congregation, or the Kaaren Kayematt, shall be deposited with the Parnass Presidenta, who shall deliver the same to his successor in office, with a regular statement thereof, within one month from the expiration of his term of office; and in case of wilful neglect or refusal, the Private Adjunta shall, previous to the next return day, commence a prosecution against him, and if after the determination of court, the property so fraudulently withheld from this Congregation, should not be restored, he shall forever be deprived of all rights, honors and privileges of this Congregation, even burial within the walls of the Beth-Hiam, until such bonds or specialties are restored, and the Congregation indemnified for all damage they have sustained.

The Gabay shall render his yearly transactions to the Private Adjunta, within one month after his term of office has expired; and in case of wilful neglect or refusal, or evading payment of any balance that may remain in his hands, due the Congregation from his office, the same procedure on the part of the Private Adjunta, shall be observed, and he shall incur the penal parts of the foregoing section in their full effect.

And should any member of the Congregation deface, destroy, embezzle, or make away with any books, papers, specialties, monies, or other valuables belonging to this Congregation, he shall be liable to all forfeitures and prosecutions, as provided against the executive officer.

And where, hitherto, there has been considerable neglect in a proper preservation of the papers and records of this Congregation, it shall henceforth be the duty of the Secretary, to take special care of any papers appertaining thereto, and to hand the same over to his successor in office; and upon failure thereof, he shall be called before the Private Adjunta, and fined at their discretion.

RULE XXVIII.

The Secretary shall keep a register of all marriages, births, and berithe and deaths that may happen in the

Congregation, and a book of record for the purpose of entering up such marriages, births, beriths and deaths; and also all legacies bequeathed to this Congregation.

He shall attend Synagogue regularly to take account of offerings, and charge the same. He shall collect all accounts due the Congregation, and pay the same over to the Gaboy monthly, his books being at all times open to the inspection of the Private Adjunta; but in no other instance shall he be bound to give them out of his possession. He shall render personal security in one or more persons, as the Private Adjunta shall direct.

RULE XXIX.

The Hazan, for performing a marriage ceremony, shall receive not less than ten dollars, to be paid him previous to such marriage, and the Shamass three dollars, who shall, if called upon, deliver the invitation cards, and attend with the canopy; and no person is permitted to perform these duties, but the officers above named, unless legally authorized by the Parnassim and Adjunta; and, in such case the Hazan and Shamass shall not be deprived of their lawful fees. Any person transgressing this law, shall be fined fifty dollars, out of which the officers shall receive their compensation, and the balance be carried to the funds of the Congregation. And the person so offending shall be deprived of all his rights and privileges, until said fine is paid.

RULE XXX.

The Hatan Yora and Hatan Berashith, shall be elected by the General Adjunta from among the Yachidim at the general election. They shall have no extraordinary claims to the honors of the Synagogue, but on their respective days. After an election of three sets of Hatanim, should they refuse to serve, the vacancy shall be filled up by the Parnassim and Private Adjunta, who shall ballot from among themselves, and to whomsoever the lot may fall, he, or they, shall be compelled to serve: but, any person, being once fined for non-acceptance, shall not be liable to be drawn, when the case shall develve on the Adjunta. And no person shall be compelled to serve in any of the above offices, more than one in every five years.

RULE XXXI.

It shall be the duty of the Parnass of the Beth-Hiam to take charge of the same, together with the hearse, and have them kept in good order. He shall be furnished with a book, wherein the Correars shall properly be laid out, and he shall at all times attend, and point out the place of burial. He shall be under the control of the Private Adjunta, and his books shall at all times be open for their inspection. And any reasonable or necessary expense incurred by said officer, shall be defrayed by the Congregation.

PRESSES OF
THE DAGGETT PRINTING COMPANY,
Charleston, S. C.
1904.

A CENTURY OF JUDAISM
IN
SOUTH CAROLINA.

1800-1900.

BY

Dr. BARNETT A. ELZAS,

Rabbi of K. K. Beth Elohim.

Barnett A. Elzas.

A Century of Judaism

...in...

South Carolina

1800-1900.

I appreciate the courtesy of The News and Courier in asking me to contribute to its centennial edition this unwritten chapter of history. I will do my best with it, though the request is one that is not easily complied with. I come at once to my theme without further introduction.

Looking back a hundred years we find only a few, small, scattered communities of Jews in the United States. The total Jewish population did not exceed, if indeed it represented a total of 2,500 souls. There was the Congregation Shearith Israel, of New York, the oldest of them all. Then there was the Congregation Yeshuat Israel of Newport, R. I., or what was left of it—for most of the Jewish population had departed with the decadence of its commerce after the Revolution. There was the small Mickveh Israel Congregation, of Savannah, and the congregation that bore the same name at Philadelphia. There was the Beth Shalome Congregation of Richmond, Va. And, finally, there was the largest community of all—K. K. Beth Elohim of Charleston, S. C. The fortunate accident of the recovery of the early records of this last congregation enables me to write this wondrously interesting chapter, which, without these records, would be utterly impossible of accomplishment.

There is no occasion for me to refer here to the men who composed this community. I have already published this portion of the story in detail in the columns of this paper. (See my Pamphlet Reprints: "A History of Congregation Beth Elohim of Charleston, S. C., 1800-1810." Charleston, S. C., November, 1902.) The personnel of the community, however, is well worthy of study, as having an important bearing upon the subsequent development of Judaism in the United States, for Charleston was the scene of the first great intellectual movement among the Jews of America and subsequently, too, was the pioneer in the evolution of that significant product—a factor that only within recent years has been recognized as a factor to be reckoned with at all—I mean American Judaism. Suffice it to say, then, that at the beginning of the nineteenth century the Jewish community of Charleston was the most cultured, as well as the largest community of Jews in America.

To understand the historical development of Judaism in South Carolina we must remember that Beth Elohim of Charleston was practically an offshoot of the old Spanish and Portuguese Jewish community of London. True, in 1800, the Portuguese Jews in Charleston were already in a minority, but Bevis Marks had left its imprint on the synagogue so indelibly that for nearly half a century thereafter the ritual followed was that of the Portuguese communities "as practiced in London and Amsterdam."

Let us now try to get a glimpse of the Charleston community ecclesiastically in the year 1800. I can give no better picture of it than that furnished by an English writer of the parent community, in a series of articles which he contributed to the London Jewish Chronicle of December 28, 1900, and January 4, 1901, entitled, "A Hundred years Ago." Here is what he has to tell of it:

The Jews were, of course, strictly orthodox. "Members of congregations were ruled with a rod of iron. * * * The most venial offence was punished with a fine, failure to pay which, might be visited with severer

penalties still. Members were frequently called before the Kahal (congregation) and made to explain their conduct or apologize for it. * * * In Bevis Marks the government was far more autocratic than in the German congregation and it is an oft-told tale how the tyrannous character of their Ascamot (by-laws) had the effect of driving Isaac D'Israeli and many another from the fold of the community. Among the Portuguese the penalty for establishing or even attending a Minyan (assembly for prayer) within the city of London and its suburbs, except during the week of mourning was excommunication. Anyone even knowing of such a meeting and not informing the Mahamad (board of elders) of it, was liable to the same penalty. And as late as the year 1822 a gentleman was visited with the utmost rigors of the law because he ventured to have a Minyan at his house on the first night of Pentecost, followed by prayers in the early morning. He and his fellow worshippers "were deprived of their seats in synagogue, their names were erased from the list of Yehidim, (voting members) they were relegated to certain places at the back of the reading desk, disqualified from being called up to the law, declared ineligible for two years for any pious duties, and finally fines of £40 and £20 respectively were inflicted upon them." * * * It was a punishable offence to offend the president, to stir up public opinion against the action of the elders or the Mahamad, to strike a person either in the synagogue or the court yard, to strike or insult anyone in the burial ground or its precincts. * * * Such offences were variously punished by fine or deprivation of rights. * * * Anyone openly desecrating the Sabbath ceased to be a Yahid. A person who married out of the faith was excluded from being a Yahid and from all the offices and honors of the synagogue. * * * Then there was a whole system of fines in vogue, for refusing to accept office, for refusing to be called up, for not attending synagogue when due to be called up, for not attending congregational or committee meetings, for not being present to

answer to one's name when it was called, or leaving before the meeting was over without the president's permission." "The wonder is," says the editorial writer in the paper above quoted, (Jewish Chronicle, January 4, 1901.) "that people could be found willing to submit to such extraordinary penalties. The synagogue must have had an immense hold upon people in those days to exact so entire a submission. It could only have wielded such a power so long as it remained the centre of the social life of the community. A defiance of its ruling would have involved a social ostracism, the fear of which must have exercised as strong a deterrent as the religious penalties that would have been incurred by contumacy.' 'Nor is it difficult to understand,' he goes on to explain, "why, in early times, the synagogue should have desired to maintain so strict a rule. Some such imperium in imperio was necessary in the interests of the Jewish community. The synagogue authorities felt themselves in a measure responsible to the political powers for the good behavior of their coreligionists. The position of English Jews was not yet consolidated. The footing on which they had been admitted into this country was still somewhat insecure, they enjoyed but scant liberties. A single false step might retard their emancipation, or endanger the liberties already won." "With the growth of a new order of things," he concludes, "this regime has passed entirely away."

I have presented the story of the Spanish and Portuguese community in London in considerable detail and I have done so for very good reasons. In the first place, if for "London' we substitute "Charleston," we shall have an absolutely accurate picture of the Jewish community in that city in the year 1800 and for twenty-four years thereafter. And in the next place, we have in this narrative a key to the origin of the great intellectual movement, which was born in Charleston in the year 1824, to which I have already referred, and of which I must now write at some little length.

South Carolina was not England. In 1800

Jews in England were excluded from all civil, municipal and political offices. No Jew could become a freeman of the city of London. Jews were thus precluded from opening retail shops and even from plying handicrafts within the precincts of the City proper. In South Carolina from the day of its settlement, the Jew has never labored under the slightest civil or religious disability whatsoever. In this respect South Carolina was unique among the British colonies. It took the Jews of England over one hundred and fifty years to win by steady fighting, step by step, the civil and religious equality that were guaranteed to the first Jew who set foot on South Carolina soil. Is it to be wondered at that the Jew in an atmosphere of perfect civil and religious freedom should develop far more rapidly and in a different way from that in which he developed in the stifling atmosphere at home?

The Jews of South Carolina at the beginning of the nineteenth century present, indeed, a curious picture. The Jew is by nature essentially conservative. Left to himself he modifies his ideas and his practices very slowly. Wherever he goes he carries the traditions of his old home with him and clings to these traditions as tender memories of bygone days. He had come originally to South Carolina, a child of the old Spanish and Portuguese community in London. It must have seemed strange to him who was accustomed to speak "with bated breath and whispered humbleness," to find a land where his brethren in faith labored under no disabilities and where they even occupied positions of the highest trust. Yet here he was, living the old life under new skies, where circumstances were so different and where his whole environment was changed. What was a natural life to him in England became an artificial life in South Carolina and it was only a question of time when he was compelled to adapt himself to his environment or to pay the penalty which isolation invariably entails.

The personnel of the Jewish community

in Charleston comes into evidence here and enables us to understand the subsequent course of events. In the early years of the nineteenth century Beth Elohim numbered amongst its members the most intellectual men amongst the Jews of America; many, too, whose fathers had lived here before them, and who by their industry and by their integrity had made the name Jew respected. The Jew was a man here. The synagogue did not, as in England, have to feel itself responsible to the political powers for the good behavior of its members. The position of the Jew was assured and that position had been strengthened by the conduct of the Jew himself. The regime of Bevis Marks, which had been in vogue in South Carolina for at least seventy years, was now an anomaly. The Jews of South Carolina had outgrown that regime and when this fact once became patent there were not wanting men with courage enough to take the first great step in the direction of progress.

And now, before speaking of the reform movement of 1824, I would protest against the prevailing conception that this movement came into existence in consequence of "early tendencies towards laxness and irreligion" and "to stem the tide of already existing disloyalty and irreligion, which were enormous in volume before the reform movement took hold." I confess that I once held this view myself, but further investigation has convinced me that this view is erroneous. I have failed to find a scintilla of evidence for it.

I was fortunate enough last year to recover a copy of the constitution of Beth Elohim of 1820. I believe it is unique and I intend to publish it shortly. This furnishes a good idea of the community religiously, as regards its internal economy, just before the time when reform was born. Read along with it the anniversary address of Isaac Harby before the Reformed Society of Israelites, (Harby's "Select Writings," pp 57-87,) and the article in the North American Review of July, 1826, (pp 67-73,) and the picture is complete.

The constitution of 1820 to which I have just referred reveals the synagogue as a severely autocratic institution. It controlled its members, both within the synagogue and without. Of this I have likewise additional and most amusing documentary evidence. The congregation was orthodox in its ritual and observance. Its members kept the Sabbath and the other sacred days, and attended the services regularly. The discipline of the synagogue compelled allegiance in these respects. The synagogue did not encourage the making of proselytes and visited with severe penalties those who might marry out of the faith. The ritual was that of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews. A portion of the service was conducted in mongrel Spanish, which no one understood. Even Hebrew was not sufficiently understood by the congregation generally to make the service intelligible. The service was long and unattractive, and had to be hurried if the hours of worship were not to be unduly protracted, which they often were. Decorum was bad. There was no discourse or religious instruction of any kind except on special occasions. Such was the state of affairs in the synagogue in Charleston in 1824, when 47 members of Beth Elohim presented a petition to the vestry asking for a revision of the ritual. It was the first step that had been made in the direction of reform among the Jews of America. What the memorialists sought, is seen from the following extracts from the petition itself:

"Your memorialists seek no other end than the future welfare and respectability of the nation. As members of the great family of Israel, they cannot consent to place before their children examples which are only calculated to darken the mind and withhold from the rising generation the more rational means of worshipping the true God.

It is to this, therefore, your memorialists would, in the first place, invite the serious attention of your honorable body. By causing the Hazan, or reader, to repeat in English such part of the Hebrew prayers as

may be deemed necessary, it is confidently believed that the congregation generally would be more forcibly impressed with the necessity of Divine worship, and the moral obligations which they owe to themselves and their Creator; while such a course would lead to more decency and decorum during the time they are engaged in the performance of religious duties. It is not every one who has the means, and many have not the time, to acquire a knowledge of the Hebrew language, and consequently to become enlightened in the principles of Judaism. What then is the course pursued in all religious societies for the purpose of disseminating the peculiar tenets of their faith among the poor and uninformed?

"The principles of their religion are expounded to them from the pulpit in language that they understand; for instance, in the Catholic, the German, and the French Protestant churches: by this means the ignorant part of mankind attend their places of worship with some profit to their morals and even improvement to their minds; they return from them with hearts turned to piety, and with feelings elevated by their sacred character. In this consists the beauty of religion—when men are invoked by its divine spirit to the practice of virtue and morality.

* * * * * * * *

"'With regard to such parts of the service as it is desired should undergo this change, your memorialists would strenuously recommend that the most solemn portions be retained, and everything superfluous excluded; and that the principal parts, and if possible all that is read in Hebrew, should also be read in English, (that being the language of the country) so as to enable every member of the congregation fully to understand each part of this service.

"In submitting this article of our memorial to the consideration of your honorable body, your memorialists are well aware of the difficulties with which they must contend before they will be enabled to accomplish this desirable end; but while they

would respectfully invite the attention of your honorable body to this part of their memorial. they desire to rest the propriety and expediency of such a measure solely upon the reason by which it may be maintained.

* * * * * * * *

"Your memorialists would next call the particular attention of your honorable body to the absolute necessity of abridging the service generally. They have reflected seriously upon its present length, and are confident that this is one of the principal causes why so much of it is hastily and improperly hurried over.

* * * * * * * *

"According to the present mode of reading the Parasa (Pentateuch) it affords to the hearer neither instruction nor entertainment, unless he be competent to read as well as comprehend the Hebrew language. But if, like all other ministers, our reader would make a chapter or verse the subject of an English discourse once a week at the expiration of the year the people would, at all events, know something of that religion which at present they so little regard." (See Harby's Anniversary Address, pp 61-2.)

The petition was sensible, moderate and dignified, but the vestry laid it on the table without discussion and thus deprived the petitioners of the right of appeal, a right that was expressly provided for in the constitution. (Rule VII.) By so doing it violated in spirit, if not in letter, that constitution which it had sworn to defend. It is absurd to claim that the vestry believed that the proposed changes struck at the fundamental principles of Judaism. No one who reads the petition can imagine any such thing. The vestry was satisfied with things as they were and that was enough. It was the regime of Bevis Marks still. But that petition was signed by men who represented the intellect of the community and they were not willing that their proposals should be thus kept even from discussion by any such mean subterfuge.

On November 21, 1824, a meeting was

called and the "Reformed Society of Israelites" organized. The Society started with about a dozen members. In two months its numbers had increased to 38, and in July, 1826, exceeded 50. In 1826 Beth Elohim had 70 subscribing members, representing about 300 souls; and the Society 50 members, making with their families over 200 souls. "The Jews born in Carolina," writes Isaac Harby in 1826, "are mostly of our way of thinking on the subject of worship, and act from a tender regard for the opinions and feelings of their parents in not joining the Society." (N. Am. Rev. for July, 1826, p 74.)

Apart from what we know of the almost patriarchial government in the family that obtained among the Jews of South Carolina in the early days, the above figures show how utterly at variance with the facts is the statement that this first reform movement was either small or insignificant—consisting of a mere handful—as one writer over-confidently puts it. Even the late Nathaniel Levin could only see in the Society a movement in which "a spirit of innovation raised its miscreant front among our people." * * * a Society that "did not increase in numbers and which, after a few years of sickly existence, became extinct." (Occident, Vol 1, pp 436 and 439.)

As a matter of fact, the best and most influential people in the community were in the Society and a large number of those who were not actually affiliated with it were in sympathy with its aims. No writer till now seems to have deemed it worth his while to ascertain the names of the people who constituted the Society and who directed it. Beyond the name of Isaac Harby we do not find in the scant literature which we possess on the subject a single name associated with it. Thus has the history of the past come down to us. But such historical writing will no longer pass muster. We must be in possession of facts if we would pass judgment.

I have thus endeavored to trace, in its proper setting, the origin of the reform movement in America. It was an indige-

ous movement; "a spontaneous impulse towards better things," "not produced either by foreign or internal violence or solicitation," as the sympathetic reviewer of Harby's "Discourse" in the North American Review, above quoted, well puts it (p 67.) The reviewer estimates the movement far more accurately than do subsequent writers, most of whom are imbued with orthodox bias. Leeser ludicrously thinks from his commendation of the "Discourse" that he "no doubt intended by his remarks to foment yet farther the spirit of discord which had exhibited itself among the Israelites of that place." (Charleston.) (Occident, Vol IX, p 211.)

I now come to the Society itself and reproduce here for its historical value a published statement of its principles. It is to be found in Goldsmith's Directory for 1831, p. 148. The publisher was the secretary of the Society in 1825:

THE REFORMED SOCIETY OF ISRAELITES.

"This Society was formed with a view of making such alterations in the customs and ceremonies of the Jewish religion as would comport with the present enlightened state of the world. It adopted, in its outset, this fundamental principle, that a correct understanding of divine worship is not only essential to our own happiness and a duty we owe to the Almighty Disposer of events, but is well calculated at the same time to enlarge the mind and improve the heart. In their creed, which accompanies their ritual, they subscribe to nothing of rabbinical interpretation, or rabbinical doctrines. They are their own teachers, drawing their knowledge from the Bible and following only the laws of Moses, and those only as far as they can be adapted to the institutions of the society in which they live and enjoy the blessings of liberty. They do nothing against the laws of Moses, but omit everything belonging to the former independent condition of their ancestors. They have simplified the worship of God and brought the great objects of public

meeting—piety, morals and sense—so as to be perfectly comprehensible to the understanding of the humblest capacity." In the appendix to their constitution, they say they wish not to overthrow, but rebuild—not to destroy, but to reform and revise the evils of which they complain. Not to abandon the institutions of Moses, but to understand and to observe them; in fine, they wish to worship God, not as slaves of bigotry and priestcraft, but as the enlightened descendants of that chosen race whose blessings have been scattered throughout the land of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob."

I have taken up so much space already, and have so much yet to tell, that I will not go into details about the "Creed" of the Society, or their method of worship. These have been fully described in a series of articles by Dr Mayer, who was rabbi of Beth Elohim from 1851 to 1856, in Einhorn's "Sinai," (Baltimore, 1856,) in Leeser's "Occident," Vol 1, pp 438-9, and are likewise discussed in an article by Dr Philipson in the London "Jewish Quarterly Review" for October, 1897. Suffice it to say, then, that the revised "Creed" consisted of ten articles, which differed materially from the thirteen articles of Maimonides that were then universally accepted in orthodox communities. The service was short and simple and the prayer book was a compilation of the most beautiful passages in the old ritual. Parts of the service were recited both in Hebrew and English. An English discourse formed part of the morning service. There was instrumental music and the congregation worshipped with uncovered heads. David Nunez Carvalho was the volunteer "Reader," and the Society met in Seyle's Masonic Hall, on Meeting street. The Society had as part of its programme the education of a youth or youths "so as to render him or them fully competent to perform divine service, not only with ability, bearing and dignity, but also according to the true spirit of Judaism, for which this institution was formed." This part of the programme seems not to have been realized.

At the first anniversary meeting of the

Society, held on November 21, 1825, the following officers were elected:

Aaron Phillips, president
Michael Lazarus, vice president.
Morris Goldsmith, secretary.
Isaac Mordecai, treasurer.
Abraham Moise, orator.

Corresponding Committee—Isaac Harby, Abraham Moise, Isaac N. Cardozo, D. N. Carvalho and E. P. Cohen.

The files of the Charleston newspapers from 1825 to 1832, furnish the lists of officers of the Society year by year. I have been unable, however, to find those for the year 1826. The following is the list of new names of those who served as officers at various times: Henry M. Hyams, Philip Benjamin, Philip Phillips, Joseph Phillips, Thomas W. Mordecai, Col Myer Jacobs, David C. Levy and Isaac C. Moses. The meetings were held on November 21 of each year, and the last meeting of which I find any record is that of November 21, 1832. It must thus have been in this year or in 1833 that the Society came to an end.

Thus ended the first great struggle for reform among the Jews of America. There were several causes that contributed to the dissolution of the Society. There was, of course, opposition from without, but this had little or nothing to do with it. There was the pressure from those connected with the members by family ties. The removal from the city of Isaac Harby in 1833, must have been severely felt and several others likely to leave Charleston at that time. The lack of theological equipment of its leaders, had nothing to do with it. The Society sought edification in its worship and amongst its members were several distinguished orators, who were fully equal to the demands of their day. The main reason was the fact that the movement was ahead of its time, and the masses were afraid to risk the experiment. That the movement lasted as long as it did—at least eight years—shows what a firm hold it had taken upon the people. Success is a relative term after all. Let the critic who would judge it fairly compare it, e. g., with two small move-

ments on similar lines that have taken place in London within the last few years, I refer to the Hampstead Sabbath afternoon services and the present Religious Union services, movements by no means as revolutionary as the one in Charleston in 1824, and he will come to a far truer estimate of the first Reformed Society of Israelites. The Society failed, but its very failure was success, for it had sowed the seeds of progress, which germinated very soon thereafter, this time successfully.

I shall now proceed with the story in bold outline and not in detail. Fulness of detail was necessary up to this point. What I have especially sought to emphasize is the fact that the Jew of South Carolina was a Jew in the synagogue, but a South Carolinian as well, and like the rest of the people of South Carolina, he has never hankered after "the primrose path of dalliance," but was willing, when conviction demanded, to pay the price of making history. Herein lies the key to the development of Judaism in South Carolina and without the understanding of which that development is not intelligible.

After the dissolution of the Society for Reformed Israelites most of its members who remained in Charleston reaffiliated with Beth Elohim. They were fined various amounts at the discretion of the trustees, and were then restored to all their former rights and privileges. For a few years the history of the synagogue was uneventful. But there was now a progressive party in Beth Elohim and the next chapter in the story is a sad tale of dissension and bitterness.

On October 9, 1836, the Rev Gustavus Poznanski was elected to the pulpit of Beth Elohim. Born of respectable parentage in Storchnest, Poland, he had been educated in Hamburg, where he became imbued with the spirit of the Hamburg Temple, then the foremost exponent of the reform movement in Europe. He was occupying a small position in New York, where he had been living for some years, when he was called to Charleston. Amongst those who recom-

mended him was Isaac Leeser, who afterwards regretted it. Poznanski was a scholar, a good speaker and writer, an able controversialist and a gentleman. At first his ministrations met with signal success. He was acceptable to both parties and his advent was followed by a marked religious revival. Even one of his bitterest opponents testifies that when he came to Charleston "laxity in attending to religious observances gave place to a strict attention to time-honored observances." (Occident, Vol 2, p 151.) But there was soon to be a "rift within the lute."

In the great fire of April 27, 1838, the synagogue was burned to the ground and steps were soon after taken to rebuild it. The corner-stone of the new building was laid on January 3, 1840. Poznanski had meanwhile been elected for life in 1838.

On July 14, 1840, before the new building was completed, the trustees were called on to act upon a petition signed by 38 members, which had been presented to them, praying "that an organ be erected in the synagogue to assist in the vocal parts of the service."

This petition was deemed by the trustees to be an infringement of the first article of the constitution. At a general meeting of the congregation held on July 26 the trustees were overruled by a vote of 47 to 40, and the prayer of the petitioners granted. This led to a division in the congregation and nearly 40 members withdrew. I will not recite at length the events of that troublous period, the plotting and the counterplotting that took place. The minute books of Beth Elohim are now available and they contain the story in fullest detail. Suffice it to say, that in 1843 the case was carried to the Courts by the seceders, the most brilliant legal talent of the day being arrayed on either side. The dominant party gained the verdict, which was affirmed when the case reached the Court of Errors and Appeals in 1846. The opinion was delivered by Judge Butler and is a magnificent document. O'Neale in his "Bench and Bar" calls special attention to it as a fine specimen of

Judge Butler's style of judicial reasoning.

How eloquent, forcible and convincing is this sample of the Judge's ringing opinion and what a lesson does it give to the religious bigot in every denomination:

"The granite promontory in the deep may stand firm and unchanged amidst the waves and storms that beat upon it, but human institutions cannot withstand the agitations of free, active and progressive opinion. Whilst laws are stationary, things are progressive. Any system of laws that should be made without the principle of expansibility, that would, in some measure, accommodate them to the progression of events, would have within it the seeds of mischief and violence. When the great Spartan lawgiver gave his countrymen laws, with an injunction never to change them, he was a great violator of law himself. For all laws, however wise, cannot be subjected to Procrustean limitations. Cessante ratione cessat lex is a profound and philosophical principle of the law."

(For the detailed opinion, see Richardson's South Carolina Law Reports, Vol 2 pp 245-256: The State vs Ancker. See also my Pamphlet Reprints: "The Organ in the Synagogue," Charleston, S. C., 1902.)

The seceders had meanwhile in 1843 formed a new congregation, Shearith Israel, (The Remnant of Israel) under the leadership of the Rev J. Rosenfeld. They had now their own place of worship on Wentworth street, though for some time previously, while the case was pending, they had occupied the old synagogue on alternate Sabbaths. So bitter was the feeling between the parties, that all intercourse between them was practically at an end. The seceders even went so far as to acquire their own cemetery, which adjoined that of Beth Elohim, but which was separated from the latter by a high wall. It was a lamentable condition of affairs. But further trouble had been brewing in Beth Elohim.

On the first day of Passover, 1843, Poznanski, who had approved the proposition to erect the organ, preached a sermon in

which he declared the observance of the second days of the festivals to be unnecessary and recommended their abandonment. The congregation was not prepared for such a radical step and a special meeting of the trustees was called on April 19, 1840, when resolutions were adopted, that the proposition was "a violation of the constitution and calculated to create discord and anarchy." Poznanski was further requested to inform the trustees "whether he intended in his future lectures to propose or advise innovations of the established form of service as observed by us, and all other congregations of Jews throughout the world." In a letter to the trustees Poznanski declared that he had been authorized by a former resolution of the trustees "to make such remarks and observations as I might deem proper," and that the majority of those who voted in favor of the resolution of disapproval, had previously well known his opinion on the subject in question. As lecturing was no part of his duty he declined to lecture any more. This letter was voted unsatisfactory. In a subsequent letter he wrote that "with the sole view of restoring and preserving peace and harmony in our congregation," he would advise no further innovations, "until the general desire of the congregation to hear the truth on any religious subject, and to have our holy religion divested of all its errors and abuses, shall be expressed to me through their representatives, your honorable board." The matter was referred to the congregation and the course of the trustees approved "without any reflection upon the Rev Hasan." At this same meeting, a resolution was offered: That the established service of this congregation embraces all the Mosaic and Rabbinical laws." It was rejected by a vote of 24 to 27. This caused a further secession, the seceders joining the "Remnants."

Thus was Judaism in Charleston in 1840 and for many years thereafter, a house divided against itself. Space forbids my following the story, interesting though it be, in detail during the rest of Poznanski's

leadership, which came to a close in 1850, after thirteen years of continuous and valiant service. In that year Poznanski retired from the pulpit and became a member of the congregation which he had so faithfully served. He continued to serve it, however, with his counsel and encouragement until he removed to New York some years later. I am strongly tempted to form an estimate here of this remarkable man, but I will not yield to the inclination, as this is not the place for it.

There were two congregations now in Charleston. Each continued its separate existence and in its own way. Both of them were weak, though Shearith Israel, marked by a greater unity of purpose, showed greater strength. This state of affairs could not last. Amongst the older men were many who remembered "the glory of the former house," and the hope of an ultimate reunion had never quite faded from their breasts. Soon after the war, they saw this long hoped for consummation realized, and in 1866, amidst great rejoicing, the two congregations again met, a united body, in "the holy and beautiful house where their fathers had praised God."

Since that time the story has been one of steady progress and development. Minor changes have been made from time to time, family pews and the Union Prayer Book have been introduced and the congregation now worships with uncovered head. But with it all, Beth Elohim is true to its ancient traditions. The spirit of faith and piety, which has ever characterized the Jew of South Carolina is living yet. May it continue to live and inspire our children with the same noble resolves that actuated their fathers in the brave days of old!

My story is at an end. I began with a picture of the community which gave birth to Beth Elohim; I can find no more fitting words with which to conclude than those of another historian of that same ancient and honorable congregation:

"I have tried to resuscitate the past and to bring it out in as faithful a light as documents and personal interpretation of them

could warrant. It is a remarkable history. Old names have again come to light. * * * Old passions have been exhibited which had long been extinguished. Old books have been opened, which had been closed for generations, and though the voices are sometimes strange and the sound distant, and though tendencies and aspirations seem to run in different directions, and individual efforts are checked by insurmountable obstacles, yet there is a constant evolution upwards and downwards. At times, noble ideas prevail and lift the congregation on to a pinnacle of loftiness, of progress, of light and learning; at other, retrogression and narrow views prevail, and the consequences make themselves felt in a narrowing of interest, in the thinning of the ranks, in the decline of men of character and of men of courage. At times a perfervid enthusiasm prevailed, at others cool indifference; but above all the conflicting currents, the great lesson stands out boldly, that good work yields a rich harvest, that great thoughts will succeed, however long and painful the process may be ere they do succeed, that the attachment to the synagogue grants to its followers and adherents some of its own eternity."

Barnett A. Elzas.

[Reprinted by the Y. M. H. A. Charleston, S. C.]

The Jews of Charleston...

A Review of the Article "Charleston" in Vol. 3, of the Jewish Encyclopaedia.

By Dr. BARNETT A. ELZAS,
Rabbi of K. K. Beth Elohim.

[Reprinted from The Charleston News and Courier, December, 1902.]

I have been an enthusiast on the subject of the Jewish Encyclopaedia from its inception. It is an epoch-making work in the history of the Jews and of Judaism, and too much praise cannot be bestowed upon the genius who first promoted it and the publishers whose enterprise has rendered its publication possible. Ten years ago the possibility of carrying a work of such magnitude to successful completion would have been looked upon as a fantastic dream of a visionary. We all rejoice to-day in the fact that the Jewish Encyclopaedia is now a reality. The third volume has just come to hand and is a most welcome addition to its predecessors.

There is one article, however, that disfigures this otherwise excellent volume: an article that is without parallel in the number of errors that it contains, and of errors that could never have been made had the article been entrusted to one who

was in the slightest degree familiar with his subject, or to one, even, who knew enough to use the available materials of others who have pursued the same line of investigation before. I regret that the article happens to be "Charleston."

I would not have gone to the trouble of reviewing this article in detail but for the fact that we are fast approaching the time when the complete story of the Jews in America will have to be written. The Jewish Encyclopaedia is itself going to furnish much of the material for the future historian. When the time comes for this story to be written—and it cannot be delayed much longer—the Jews of Charleston will be found to occupy a far more prominent place in the picture than many now imagine, for Charleston has from the first been marked as a maker of history, and the Jews of Charleston have never been insignificant in the community to which they belonged.

I will now proceed to an examination of this remarkable article—for the article is, in truth, a most remarkable one. It is written by Mr L. Huhner, A. M., LL. B., of New York, contains about a thousand words and more mistakes in those thousand words than I have ever met with in any single volume in the whole course of my reading experience. Mr Huhner is a prominent member of the American Jewish Historical Society, who, I am told, has made a specialty of South Carolina Jewish history. In the bibliography at the end of his article he refers twice to himself—one reference being to an article that is not yet published. It is well that we have it, even if only from Mr Huhner himself, that he is an authority on the subject on which he writes; we certainly would never have suspected it from this specimen of his handiwork.

The article begins, as an article on Charleston should begin, with the information that Charleston is in South Carolina, which is in the United States. But Mr Huhner cannot even tell that straight. He incidentally notes that it is the "capital of the county of the same name." Such a misuse of terms is surprising in one educated for the Bar. Charleston is the county seat, but not the capital of Charleston County. In America States have capitals and not counties.

Next follow references to the earliest mention of a Jew in Charleston and to Locke's Constitution. Both of these references are absolutely correct and are worthy of special mention on that account. There is little else of which the same can be said.

In the next item we are informed that "in 1702 Jews appeared in numbers and they seem to have influenced a general election." This is very vague, but I will not examine it too closely. Mr Huhner evidently does not understand the quotation from Rivers with reference to the bigoted Dissenters who protested in 1703 against the "Jews aliens" who had voted in the last election. The protest was against the legality of the election and had nothing to do with its result, for the Jewish vote had not affected it.

In the list of the earliest members of Beth Elohim Meshod Tobias appears as "Michael" Tobias; Mordecai Sheftall's name is spelt "Sheftail"—a clear misprint, and Levy Sheftall's name is omitted.

The next item of information is really funny. Moses Lindo is rightly quoted as the most conspicuous man among the Jews of South Carolina in provincial days. Mr Huhner refers to him as "Inspector General for South Carolina!" He evidently takes Lindo for a military man. Any-

one who has read the newspapers of the period knows that Lindo was "His Majesty's inspector general of Indico" (indigo) and later also of tobacco.

We now come to the interesting period of the Revolution. Here Mr Huhner is at his best as a manufacturer of history At the outbreak of the war, Mr Huhner tells us, the most prominent Jew was Francis Salvador, "who resided near Charleston, and whose remains are interred in the old Charleston Cemetery." Salvador, he further informs us, "was a member of the Colonial Assembly as early as 1774, and of the Provincial Congress as well. He was one of the leading patriots of the South."

This brief notice of Salvador is extraordinary, coming, as it does, from one who has written a special monograph on him for the Jewish Historical Society. Francis Salvador was certainly his name, and Francis Salvador was as certainly a patriot. But Francis Salvador did not live near Charleston, but at Ninety Six, which is in the northwest of the State, almost as far from Charleston as one could get without leaving South Carolina. Nor was Salvador "a member of the Colonial Assembly as early as 1774." There never was such a body in South Carolina as "the Colonial Assembly." There was a "Commons House of Assembly of the Province of South Carolina," but no House was elected after Salvador came to America. Salvador came to South Carolina during the latter part of 1773, and the last election for the Commons House of Assembly ever held in South Carolina took place in 1772. Nor are Salvador's remains interred in the old Charleston Cemetery. Salvador met his tragic end at Essenecca, some fifty miles from where he lived. (See Huhner's "Francis Salvador" in publications of American Jewish Historical Society,

Vol 9, p. 120.) He may have been buried where he fell or he may have been carried to his own plantation. We have no information on the subject. It is Joseph Salvador who is buried here—the uncle and father-in-law of the patriot—and he is buried, not in the old burial ground here, (Coming street) but in the Da Costa ground. (Hanover street.)

"During the struggle for independence," we are next informed, "the Jews of Charleston distinguished themselves by their patriotism. Not a single case of Toryism was to be found among them."

This would indeed be a remarkable fact were it true and a notable exception to traditional Jewish loyalty to the sovereign Power. The veriest tyro, however, who knows anything at all of the history of South Carolina during the Revolution, could not be guilty of writing such nonsense. There were numbers of Jewish Tories in Charleston at the outbreak of the Revolution, and we have no reason to be ashamed of it. There was as much of patriotism in the Tory as there was in the most ardent Revolutionist and we meet with the very best in South Carolina as loyal subjects of the Crown. I need not mention names. McCrady has enough on the subject for anyone who desires the information. There is no excuse for such ignorance in a man who pretends to have looked into the original sources for his facts—and no man can write history without doing this—else he is liable to be in hot water all the time.

In the well known "Petition to Sir Henry Clinton," signed by 166 citizens of Charles Town, there are the names of seven well known Jews, (including some of Mr Huhner's "patriots.") This petition sets forth that the petitioners "were very desirous to shew every mark of allegiance and at-

tachment in their power to his Majesty's person and Government, to which they were most sincerely affected, and, therefore, humbly prayed that they might have an opportunity to evince the sincerity of their professions."

In the Proclamation dated September 19, 1780, we are informed that "The said Memorials and Petitions had been referred to gentlemen of known loyalty and integrity, as well as knowledge of the persons and characters of the inhabitants, in order to report the manner in which the Memorialists had heretofore conducted themselves; and that they having made their report in favor of the persons undermentioned (166 names, including the aforesaid 7 well-known Jews.) Notice is hereby given that if they will apply at the State House * * * and there * * * subscribe a declaration of their allegiance, they will receive a certificate, which will entitle them to use the free exercise of their trades or professions, and the privileges enjoyed by the other loyal inhabitants of Charles-town."

(The Royal South Carolina Gazette, Thursday, September 21, 1780.)

In the list of those whose estates after the Revolution were "amerced in a fine of 12 per cent ad valorem," there is likewise a well-known Jewish name. (See "Statutes of South Carolina, Vol VI, p. 623.

But we are not yet through with Mr Huhner's story of the Revolution.

Mr Huhner next refers to the traditional "Corps of volunteer infantry"—which in the next line is magnified into a regiment (!) "composed almost exclusively of Israelites," and "which was organized in 1779." "This regiment," Mr Huhner continues, "subsequently fought at the Battle of Beaufort."

This special corps of King street Jewish merchants is, I am satisfied, one of the myths of history. Mr Huhner evidently

refers to Capt Richard Lushington's Company of the Charles-Town Regiment of Militia. This contained several Jews, the names of whom have come down to us, but they are not those mentioned by Mr Huhner. This regiment was not organized in 1779, but had been in existence since 1738 and had merely entered the service of the Revolutionary Government of the State. Nor did this regiment serve at the Battle of Beaufort, but only a detachment of it.

I will not here discuss the names referred to by Mr Huhner as having served on the field. He mentions only nine men. He informs us that Mordecai Sheftall was commissary general for South Carolina and Georgia. It is strange that Mr Heitman does not put him down as a Continental officer if he occupied such a position. He certainly did not hold this office for the State of South Carolina. The statement, too, that most of the Jews served as officers, is not a fact, as I shall elsewhere show.

Major Nones belongs to Philadelphia, and Mordecai Myers to Georgetown and not to Charleston.

Among the Jews who held high offices in the State during the early portion of the nineteenth century are mentioned Myer Moses, a member of the Legislature in 1810, and Franklin J. Moses, Chief Justice of South Carolina. Franklin J. Moses was not Chief Justice until after the Confederate war.

Amongst "other" prominent Charleston Jews during the early part of the nineteenth century we find Myer Moses, one of the first "Commissioners of Education." Mr Huhner evidently thinks that he is dealing with two people. There were two distinguished men who bore the name of Myer Moses. The above references, however, are both to Myer Moses, Jr. Nor was he "one of the first "Commissioners

of Education." There was no such office in existence at that time. Myer Moses, Jr, was one of the "Commissioners of Free Schools"—a purely local office, which had been in existence for upwards of a hundred years before Myer Moses, Jr, was elected to it.

The first Jewish Reform movement began in Charleston in 1824 and not in 1825, as stated by Mr Huhner.

Isaac Harby was a prominent member of that movement, but he never was editor of the City Gazette. John Geddes, Jr, was editor in Harby's day.

The second split in Congregation Beth Elohim, in consequence of the introduction of the organ, took place in 1840 and not in 1843, as Mr Huhner states.

And lastly, the item with reference to the part played by the Jews of Charleston in the Confederate war, can only be read with feelings of contempt and disgust. Here it is:

"At the outbreak of the civil war the Jews of Charleston joined their Gentile brethren in the Confederate cause. One of the prominent soldiers of the Confederacy was Dr Marx E. Cohen." (!) No one questions the gallantry of this young soldier, who was shot at Bentonville, but why select him alone of the hundreds who rendered equally signal service to their State? I dismiss the paragraph without further comment. One might wonder, however, whether such notices are inserted at advertising rates.

I could have said much more, but forbear. Mr Huhner has covered himself with glory. He has erected to himself a monument more lasting than bronze. If anyone can point out the like of his work in the literature of ignorance, I would like to know it. I think that he has accomplished a unique feat—and all in a thou-

sand words! We may well congratulate ourselves. What would have happened if he had written two thousand? The thought is appalling.

In conclusion, I would not have my readers carry away the impression that the article, "Charleston," in the Jewish Encyclopaedia, by L. Huhner, A. M., LL. B., is a fair sample of that magnificent work. It is merely an illustration of the methods of department editors, who for reasons best known to themselves, entrust special work to those utterly incompetent to accomplish it. "Vaulting ambition doth sometimes o'erleap itself." Perhaps some department editors are not quite as familiar with their fields as their admiring friends or a generous public have led them to believe.

The Charleston Jewish community may not be as large to-day as it was in former years, but from a thorough knowledge of its past I do not hesitate to declare that its influence to-day in commerce, in civil affairs, and in the professions generally—taking it as a whole—is as great as it ever was. It is an ancient community and during the two centuries of its history its record has been a glorious one. It was worthy of a better fate than to be thus mercilessly butchered at the hands of a raw, amateur, would-be-historian.

THE DAGGETT PRINTING CO.,
CHARLESTON, S. C.

The Jews of South Carolina....

A Survey of the Records at Present Existing in Charleston.

To write an adequate and comprehensive history of the Jews of South Carolina today is a task of enormous difficulty. Not that there is any dearth of material to him who has the patience and the industry to go after it, but because many valuable documents are no longer in existence; and, furthermore, because a vast amount of material bearing upon the history of South Carolina during the Revolutionary period and indirectly, therefore, upon that of the Jews, is at present hidden away in Columbia, where it will be some years before it will be available to the historian.

The oldest records of the Congregation Beth Elohim, too, have disappeared. Those which I recently recovered, valuable though they be, only date from 1800. The oldest records, with the exception of one volume, were no longer in existence in 1844, which fact was elicited in the examination of Solomon Valentine, the then Secretary of the Congregation in the trial of The State vs Ancker, of which I have written elsewhere. ("The Organ in the Synagogue," reprinted from The News and Courier, November, 1902.)

Even that one precious volume is gone. But in spite of this I think that we can obtain from the rich historical material still remaining in Charleston, a tolerably good glimpse in outline of the history of the Charleston Jewish community—enough

at least to enable some future and more capable worker in this field, to fill in the details and reconstruct it in its entirety. Personally, I can only hope to gather up a few scattered threads; and I shall, as far as possible, let the records speak for themselves.

The story of South Carolina is indeed a thrilling one. From 1670, when it was first settled, down to this day, it has been one long tale of glorious achievement. In not a few things has this State set the pace to her sister States, but in nothing may she feel a more justifiable pride than in the broad and liberal principles on which she was founded.

"In the year 1669," we read in the records, "the Lords 'did encourage severall people to come in their Vessells to inhabitt this part of their province and with the said people did aisoe 'send Fundamll Lawes, Constitucons under the hands & Seales of six of their Lordshipps bearing date 21st July, '69, as the unalterable forme & rule of Governmt for ever.' "

(Langdon Cheves, Esq, in "Shaftesbury Papers"—Note to p 117.)

This Constitution of John Locke (1669,) was a veritable Magna Charta of liberty and tolerance. South Carolina started right. My chief concern being the Jews of South Carolina, I would especially call attention to Article 87 of that Constitution. It is to be found in the Shaftesbury Papers in the 5th volume of the Collections of the South Carolina Historical Society:

"87. But since ye natives of yt place who will be concernd in ou. plantations are utterly strangers to Christianity, whose idolatry, ignorance, or mistake gives us noe right to expell or use ym. ill, & those who remove from other parts to plant there, will unavoydably be of diff-

rent opinions concerning matters of religion, ye liberty whereof they will expect to have allowed ym., & it will not be reasonable for us on this account to keep ym. out yt civil peace may be maintaind amidst ye diversity of opinions, & our agreement & compact with all men may be duly & faithfully observed, ye violation whereof upon what p'tence soever, cannot be without great offence to Almighty God, & great scandal to the true religion yt we p'fesse, & also yt heathens, Jnes, and other dissenters from the purity of Christian religion may not be scared and kept at a distance from it, but by having an oppertunity of acquainting themselves with ye truth & reasonablenes of its doctrines, & ye peacablenes & inoffencivenes of its professors, may by good usage and perswasion, & all those convincing methods of gentlenes & meeknes sutable to ye rules & designe of the Ghospel, be wone over to imbrace and unfeynedly receive ye truth. Therefore any seaven or more persons agreeing in any religion shall constitute a church or profession to wch. they shall give some name to distinguish it from others."

Little wonder, then, that the persecuted Jew, like the persecuted Huguenot and German Palatine, soon came here to find a haven of rest. To be undisturbed in the possession of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," and to enjoy the privilege of worshipping God as his conscience dictated—these have ever been the ideals of the Jew, even as they were the ideals upon which this great Republic was established. For by far the greater part of his history, in every country, some or all of these "inalienable rights of man" have been denied him. Here he could have them all, and in fullest measure. South Carolina

welcomed him, welcomed him as a man, welcomed him as a brother; welcomed him as a citizen, and the Jew showed himself worthy of the confidence that was reposed in him. It is no idle boast to claim that there are none who have shed more lustre upon the annals of this State, or have done more towards its upbuilding, than have its Jewish citizens.

When did the Jews first come here and where did they come from? Thereby hangs an interesting tale.

In the Charleston Library there is a reprint of a unique volume entitled "A New Description of that Fertile and Pleasant Province of Carolina, by John Archdale, Late Governor of the Same." (London, 1707.) It was reprinted in Charleston in 1822. On page 22 there occurs the following interesting narrative:

"Now that the Reader may plainly discern, that the Almighty and Omniscient God, takes cognizance of Human Affairs, and directs them by a wise and prudent Chain of Causes, I shall relate some remarkable Passages that happened quickly after that I entered upon the Government, which was the 17th of August, 1695. There is a Nation of Indians call'd the Kammussees, who formerly lived under the Spanish Government, but now live under the English, about 80 Miles from Charles-Town. Some of these Indians going a Hunting, about 200 Miles to the Southward, met with some Spanish Indians that lived about Sancta Maria, not far from Augustine, the Seat of the Spanish Government; and taking them Prisoners, brought them Home, designing to sell them for Slaves to Barbadoes or Jamaica as was usual; but I understanding thereof, sent for their King, and ordered him to bring these Indians with him to Charles-Town, which

accordingly he did: There were three Men and one Woman; they could speak Spanish, and I had a Jew for an interpreter. so upon examination, I found they profess'd the Christian Religion as the Papists do: upon which I thought in a most peculiar manner, they ought to be freed from slavery; and thereupon order'd the King to carry them to Augustine to the Spanish Governour with a Letter, desiring an Answer relating to the receit of them: who having receiv'd them; sent me the following Letter: So far as relates to this Affair, I copy it forth:"

(Here follows the letter, which is of no interest to our investigation.)

Who was this Jew who lived in Charles-Town in the year 1695? Can we find him elsewhere? Were there others here at that early date? The records will help us.

In the Probate Records, 1694-1704, p. 133, Abraham Avilah, of Charles Towne, in ye County of Berkley and Province of Carolina, "for divers good causes and considerations me at this time especially moveing and more especially out of trust and confidence which I repose in Mr Simon Valentine M-cht, make him my true and lawfull attorney." This Power of Attorney is dated March 25, 1698.

We meet with this Simon Valentine several times in the old records. He writes his name Simon Valentyn. On page 339 of the same volume, Jacob Mears, of ye Parish of Port Royall, in ye Island aforesaid (Jamaica,) appoints "his trusty friend William Smith, of Carolina, merchant, his true and lawfull Attorney, to demand of Simon Valentine, of Carolina, shopkeeper, all and every such Debt and Debts, Sum and Sums &c, as may be owing to him." This deed is dated July 3, 1701. His name

also appears on p. 410, on a document dated January 24, 1704. In the volume, 1692-3, we find him several times as a surety on administration bonds. His name occurs on pp 248, 256, 259 and 357. The earliest of these documents bears the date of 1696.

The last reference to this Simon Valentine is interesting, as it is the earliest record here of a Jew holding land. In the volume of Miscellaneous Records, 1714-1717, (p. 233.) there is a record of a mortgage of a farm of 350 acres from Mordicai Nathan to Henry Peronneau which land, the deed tells us, "was formerly purchased by the said Mordicai Nathan and Symond Valentine, Deceased, being Joyn purchers, whom the said Mordicai has survived." It may be explained here, that according to the old law, when two people bought a piece of land in common, should one of them die, the land belonged to the survivor. This law has since been repealed by Statute.

The next document of interest is an old will, that is to be found in the volume, "Wills, 1671-1727."

Abraham Isack, of Cyty of New Yorke, "being bound to sea, and therefore being present in good health, but not knowing when it may please the Almighty God to take me out of ye world," makes his will. It is dated May 26, 1709, and was recorded in Charleston February 20, 1710.

It is now some years before the records make further mention of Jews. In 1739 we find two documents concerning Joseph Tobias, Shopkeeper—one a lease and the other a transfer of property. They are to be found in the Mesne Conveyance Records. (W. 471 and PP 656.) We find this same Joseph Tobias in one of the inventories of an estate. (Mesne Conveyance, 1749-50. p. 75.)

The last of the records that I have been

able to find occurs in the Probate Records for 1736-40. On p. 3 there is a letter from New York, dated November 25, 1743, and addressed to Messrs Daniel and Thomas La Roche, of Charleston. Mr Jacob Frank refers to his nephew, Mr Moses Solomons, and some difficulty which the said Moses Solomons had had with some London shipping house. On the next page David Franks, of Charles Town, Gent. declares that the letter signed Jacob Frank is the handwriting of his father. It would seem from another letter here recorded that Franks had connections in Lisbon. On page 300 there is a bond of Samuel Levy and Moses Salamons of Charlestown, merchants, to Daniel La Roche & Thomas La Roche, of Winyau, for £2,005.6.8.

Leaving the records let us now look at the Jews of early South Carolina, in their private life. As we have seen, the Jew here has never labored under any civil or religious disability whatsoever. As early as 1763 it is on record that Jews voted at the popular election for members of the Commons House of Assembly. This toleration on the part of the Established Church party in South Carolina brought forth a protest from the bigoted Dissenters of that day, who complained that "At this last election, Jews strangers, sailors servants, negroes and almost every Frenchman in Craven and Berkeley counties came down to elect, and their votes were taken; the persons by them voted for were returned by the Sheriff."

(Rivers, "South Carolina," quoted by McCrady in "South Carolina Under the Proprietary Government," p. 391.)

It is a pity that we cannot get a glance at the answer to this protest. It would be interesting, indeed, but it is unfortunately not available.

The next point of interest in our inves-

tigation is the question of how the Jews made a living in those early days. Here the Gazettes will help us.

There were exceedingly few professional men in the Province in those days—doctors, lawyers and clergymen. With the exception of a few handicraftsmen and planters, the entire population subsisted by trade. Competition must have been very keen, for everybody seems to have had almost the same things for sale and to have advertised them in the very same way. Let us look at the advertisements in the South Carolina Gazettes, between the years 1731 and 1750.

The earliest Jewish names that I have found in the Gazettes occur in an advertisement of August 17, 1734, when Messrs Carvallo & Gutteres announce that they "have to dispose of "Good Old Barbados Rum. Good Madera Wine. Muscovado Sugar & Limejuice; Likewise some dry goods, &c, living in Church street, where formerly the printing office was." I am not quite certain that these were Jews.

In the Gazette of November 22, 1735, Mr Carvallo advertises for sale "a very good Rhode Island Pacing-Horse."

On September 14, 1738, Isaac De Pas in Union street offers to sell "Good White Sugar, very good Barbados Rum & very fine Citron Water," etc, etc. On February 20, 1744, he advertises his wares at his shop on Broad street, and on March 19, 1744, he announces to his patrons that "All gentlemen that have rice to dispose of may have two Parts in ready Cash and the Balance in Cordials of all sorts or any other goods that I have to sell."

On August 25, 1739, we read the following: "To Be Sold in Union St, by Moses de Mattos, White, Milk, Ship, Middling & Brown Bread & Loaf Sugar. The same

may be had of Mr Tobias on the Bay. Also good Esopius Flour." He is still in Union street, on November 1, 1742.

In the Gazette of April 3, 1742, there is an announcement of the "Half-Yearly Festival of the right worthy & amicable Order of UBIQUARIANS. Moses Solomon. Esq, is one of the Aediis.

On December 16, 1745, Solomon Isaacs advertises as the administrator of an estate, and on the same date Joseph Tobias announces that as he intends to leave the Province in March, he would like those indebted to him to come and settle. In the meantime, "I have most kinds of Cordial Drams to sell by Wholesale or Retail, Checks, Oznabrugs, hard Ware, Linnens & sundry other Goods.

The last advertisement is that of Solomon Isaacs & Co. on October 10, 1748. They offer for sale Negro Cloth, woollen and linen goods, etc. "at the House on the Bay, in which Capt Colcock lives."

So far the Records and the Gazettes. Summing up, then, our inquiry thus far We have found a Jew in Charleston in 1695. I believe that he came from Jamaica, where Jews have lived from a very early date. We also found other Jews here before 1700. I believe that they came from London. We have followed the Jew in his daily life and as a citizen. We have seen how, socially and religiously, he was at peace with his neighbors. He lived the same life and followed the same occupations that they did, taking his full part in the burdens as well as in the privileges of citizenship.

There were other Jews in Charleston in the year 1750. Of these I shall tell in my next article. Till now, it is the Records in Charleston that have been speaking.

THE JEWS OF SOUTH CAROLINA . . .

A Survey of the Records
at Present Existing in Charleston.

. . . BY . . .

Dr. BARNETT A. ELZAS,

Rabbi of K. K. Beth Elohim.

II

1750-1783.

Reprinted from the Charleston News and Courier, March [illegible]

The Jews of South Carolina...

II.

1750-1783.

A sympathetic critic, referring to the style in which my notes are being published, remarks that "a history written in this manner would dismay the stoutest heart." Of course it would. But I am not writing history now. I am merely rendering the data out of which alone history can be written, available for the future historian. Without facts there can be no history. After I have set out at length all that is known, it will be easy enough to put this material into proper shape. Even now I try to make the dry facts as interesting as I can. If I am uninteresting, it is not because I have not tried to be otherwise.

There is another reason why I am going into minute detail. The old records are going to pieces. Twenty years from now, many of the documents to which I refer will no longer be legible. Some of them are already crumbling. The ink on the pages of many of the Gazettes is fading and if I have by my work preserved permanently only a few records of the Jews of this State, the dulness of detail will be more than compensated.

Let me further offer in extenuation this fact: By far the greater part of my material is unindexed. Even with accurate references to the Gazettes, the future worker may have to spend hours in looking up a single reference, for many of these papers were misplaced by the cars-

less binder. I have therefore striven to attain absolute accuracy in every one of my printed references and have confirmed each one of these references before reprinting my articles. My object in reprinting and distributing these pamphlets is merely to allow future correction and revision from material that may exist in the hands of others. When my material is in shape, I shall then attempt my history. My present article will cover the period from 1750 till the end of the Revolution, reserving for a special chapter the Jews in the Revolution.

In my last article, I showed that quite a number of Jews lived in Charleston prior to 1750. In the list of members of the St Andrew's Society of the City of Charleston for 1740-1748, there are the names of David Franks and Moses Solomons. We have already made the acquaintance of the latter in 1742 and 1743.

Georgia was colonized in 1732 and we are told that a few days after its first settlement forty Jews arrived in Savannah. So illiberal was the policy of the Trustees of the Colony that in 1741 the bulk of the Jews left it. Some went to Pennsylvania, others to New York and four, viz: Mordecai Sheftall, Levi Sheftall, David de Olivera and Jacob de Olivera came to Charles Town. We do not meet with any of them, however, in the records prior to 1750.

We have already seen that in 1748 there had been an idea discussed in London, of making a settlement of Jews in Charles Town. The original documents which I have published show that the negotiations came to nothing. In 1750, however, several Jews came to Charles Town and we read: ("Occident Vol. 1. p. 337. See also Year Book for 1883, p. 301,) that in that year the following Jews lived here:

Moses Cohen, Isaac Da Costa, Abraham Da Costa, Joseph Tobias, Meshed Tobias, Moses Pimenta, David de Olivera, Mordecai Sheftall, Levy Sheftall, Michael Lazarus, Abraham Nunez Cardozo and Philip Hart. This same year (1750) saw the first beginnings of the Congregational history of K. K. Beth Elohim.

The late Mr Nathaniel Levin, who wrote both the sketch in the Year Book and that in the "Occident," used the old record-book of Beth Elohim as the source of his information. The volume is unfortunately no longer in existence. It recorded the fact that at the conclusion of the Jewish New Year 5510 (1750) a meeting was called for the purpose of organizing a congregation. Moses Cohen was elected Chief Rabbi, Isaac Da Costa, Reader, and Joseph Tobias, President. The name selected for the Congregation was the same which it still bears: "Kahal Kadosh Beth Elohim." (The Holy Congregation Beth Elohim.) About the same time, the Hebrew Benevolent Society was established—a society that still exists and carries on the work of its founders. The Congregation was strictly orthodox and its ritual that of the Spanish and Portuguese communities as practiced in London and Amsterdam.

There is no necessity for me to enter here into the details of its internal economy or to refer to the various buildings in which the Congregation worshipped. These details are fully given in the articles before mentioned and will be discussed when I write my history. I will state, however, that the best account of the early communal history of the congregation is that given in the report of the State vs Ancker in Richardson's South Carolina Law Reports, Vol 2, pp. 235-236.

FIRST CHIEF RABBI MOSES COHEN.

The organization of the Congregation

Beth Elohim was brought about through the zeal of Moses Cohen. Who Moses Cohen was I do not know. He came from London in 1750 and we have seen that in that year he was elected the first Chief Rabbi. His full title was "Haham v' Ab Beth Din, (Chief Rabbi and Chief of the Beth Din or Ecclesiastical Court.) This was probably nothing more than a high-sounding title in imitation of the old Synagogue of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews at Bevis Marks, London, of which the Congregation Beth Elohim is a direct offshoot. Of his activity in this community I likewise know nothing. If he has left any literary remains, I am unaware of them. The only references to him in the contemporary literature that I have been able to find occur in two advertisements in the South Carolina Gazette. In the Supplement to the Gazette of August 15, 1753, he advertises for "a runaway Dutch servant-girl about 10 years of age and 4 feet 6 inches high," and on October 21, 1756, his name is mentioned in a list of unrecorded plats. In my search amongst the records in Columbia, I found three grants made to him in the "Grant Book," dated 1755 and 1759.

Moses Cohen, or as he is described on his tombstone, "The Right Reverend Moses Cohen, D. D." died on April 19, 1762. He is interred in the Coming Street Cemetery, which at that time was not yet the property of the Congregation Beth Elohim, but the private burial ground of the family of Isaac Da Costa. He was much esteemed by his Congregation and in the Constitution of 1820 it is especially enacted (Rule XX) that "On every Kippur night perpetually, the first "escaba" (prayer for the dead) shall be made for the Reverend Moses Cohen, deceased, because he was appointed and confirmed the Reverend Doctor of this Congregation

from its first establishment, and as such it is conceived every mark of respect is due to his memory."

This custom has not been kept up in my time. When I came here in 1894, the list of those of whom special mention was to be made was not here and there was no one who could restore it. It was lost until I recently recovered it in New York.

The next man to whom I devote attention is an exceedingly interesting character--Isaac Da Costa. As we have seen he was the first Reader of the Congregation Beth Elohim.

ISAAC DA COSTA.

In the "Literary Diary" of Ezra Stiles, Vol 1, p. 453, under the date August 2, 1774, there is the following interesting item:

"In the Afternoon I was visited by Mr Acosta a Jew Huzzan of the Synagogue in Charleston, So Carolina. He is aet. 52, born in London & educated under Hochem Rabbi Nieto there till aet. 29. Then he came to America & in 1754 instituted a Synagogue at Charleston." (See Kohut: "Ezra Stiles and the Jews,' p. 134.)

This entry is particularly valuable because from it, together with the data given in his death notice, we can positively establish the date of his arrival in Charles Town as 1750.

Though Isaac Da Costa was trained as a Reader for the Synagogue and officially occupied that position, we find him shortly after his arrival engaged in trade. We meet with him first as a shopkeeper, in the South Carolina Gazette of July 22, 1751. On May 28, 1752, he is on Broad street. On November 26, 1753, he advertises as an administrator of an estate. In this year I find his name on the records of King Solomon's Lodge, No 1--the oldest regularly constituted Lodge in South Carolina. On October 21, 1756, his name occurs in a

"list of unrecorded plats." On June 30, 1757, he is still on Broad street, where he advertises "European and Indian goods." On November 17, 1758, he is in partnership with Thos Farr and the firm is now Da Costa & Farr. On April 7, 1759, he advertises as treasurer of Solomon's Lodge. On January 17, 1761, the firm is still Da Costa & Farr. They are extensive ship agents, (Nov 28, and Dec 5, 1761.) On Oct 30, 1762, Isaac Da Costa advertises alone—it is no longer Da Costa & Farr. In 1764, having some misunderstanding with his Congregation, Isaac Da Costa resigned his position as Reader. From an advertisement on Aug 3, 1765, he seems to have met with misfortune in business. On July 14, 1766, he advertises again. On April 2, 1772, he is agent for the Spanish Transport "The Diana." He is on King St. on April 19, 1773. On July 4, 1774, he embarked for Rhode Island and on Dec 12, he returns with Miss Da Costa and Mr Abraham Jacobs. In the Gazette of the State of South Carolina of July 8, 1778, we find him in partnership with his son, and on Nov 25 of that year he is away from town—there are three letters waiting for him at the Post Office. On July 21, 1779, we read that "At the last anniversary meeting of the Palmetto Society, Isaac Da Costa was elected one of the stewards." From the Royal Gazette of Mar 14, 1781, we learn that his estates were seized and confiscated by the British. In the "Diary of Josiah Smith, Jr—one of the exiles from Charlestown to St Augustine, during the British occupation, 1780-1781," (unpublished MSS) he is mentioned among the "heads of families banished, who would not take protection." The date of his arrival in Philadelphia is here given as Dec 31, 1781. In 1782 we find his name, as well as that of his son enrolled among the original members of the Mikveh Israel Congrega-

tion of Philadelphia. (Morais "Jews of Philadelphia, p. 15.) In 1783, he returns to Charleston and in February of that year he establishes the "Sublime Grand Lodge of Perfection." (Mackey's "Cryptic Masonry, p. 151.) He died on Sunday, the 23rd of Nov, 1783, in the 62nd year of his age. Here is the notice of his death in the Gazette of the State of South Carolina," for Nov 27, 1783:

"On Monday died, after a few days' illness, by the wound of a splinter in his hand, Mr Isaac Da Costa, Sen, a respectable and valuable citizen."

Isaac Da Costa is buried in the private burial ground at Hanover street that still bears his name. He left no will, but letters of administration to his estate were granted to Mrs Sarah Da Costa, Joseph Da Costa and Samuel Da Costa on Mar 31, 1784.

DA COSTA-PIMENTA.

I do not know quite as much about Abraham Da Costa. He is, however, mentioned in one of the most interesting documents that have till now passed through my hands. It is a marriage agreement that reminds us of mediaeval times.

In M. C. Records, Vol MM for 1763-7, p. 222, and bearing the date Feb 15, 1765, there are the Articles of Agreement between Abraham Da Costa and Rebecca Pimenta and Leah Pimenta, her mother" * * Abraham Da Costa, "with the consent and good liking of the said Leah, covenants, promises and agrees to take Rebecca Pimenta to wife according to the rights and ceremonies of the Jews without portion to be demanded or required, within the space of three months from the date of these presents * * * the said parties binding themselves each to the other in the sum or penalty of £3000 current money of South Carolina."

In the Vol. "Miscellaneous" for 1767-1771, p. 479, there is a marriage settlement of Abraham Da Costa to Rebecca Pimenta. He seems to have had a business in Georgetown, for in the South Carolina and American General Gazette of Mar 26, 1773, he "informs his town and country friends that since the late dreadful fire, he is under an obligation to open a store at the upper end of King st. where he has to sell a great quantity of the goods lately sold at Georgetown, and some of the remains saved out of the above fire." In the Royal Gazette of May 22, 1782, he announces that he has opened the "Irish Coffee House" on Broad st. I find his name only once in a real estate transaction, in 1779. (M. C., Vol B 5, p. 90.)

Of David de Olivera I find no mention in the records. Jacob Olivera died in Charles Town soon after 1770 and there is an inventory of his effects in the Probate Records. (Inventories 1751-3, pp. 409-10.) There is no reference to Abraham Nunez Cardozo, except the notice of his death in the S. C. G. for Nov 20, 1762. Here it is:

NOV 17th.—This day died, Abraham Cardozo, first cousin to Madam Sarah Da Costa, of a hurt received the 10th instant, in Rebellion-Road, to the great grief of his wife" HANNAH CARDOZO

JOSEPH TOBIAS.

I have already referred to Joseph Tobias, the first President of Beth Elohim. We found him here in 1739. There is this item concerning him in Columbia amongst the documents from the State Paper Office in London: "List of persons qualified according to the Act for naturalising Protestants in his Majesty's Colonies in America, Joseph Tobias a Jew Certificate. Recorded 11 December, 1741." We meet with him several times in the office of Mesne Conveyance. He died Jan 29, 1761, aged 76.

Masoad Tobias (pronounced Meshod) was the son of Joseph Tobias. He died on Feb 27, 1798, aged 57. He must therefore have been born in Charleston..

Joseph Tobias had a son Jacob, who died in 1773. He had another son Joseph whose son, Jacob Tobias was a member of Capt Drayton's Militia Company in 1775. He died on Nov 16, 1775, aged 26. He could therefore hardly have seen service in the Revolution.

Moses Pimenta, we are told, was "a man learned in the law and a teacher of the Jewish youth." In the "Inventories" 1756-8, estate of Solomon Isaacs, there is a note of his. Moses Pimenta apparently learnt by experience that teaching Jewish youth is by no means an easy road to affluence.

Mordecai Sheftall and Levi Sheftall were the sons of Benjamin Sheftall, one of the original Jews who settled in Savannah. They are more closely connected with the history of that community, though they did business and for a while lived in Charleston. In the M. C. Records O 3, p. 501, Mordecai Sheftall, of the Province of Georgia, makes a marriage settlement, dated 1761, to "Frances Hart, of Charles Town, the daughter of Moses Hart, at present in the Hague in Europe." In the Volumes M 5, p. 308, and Z 4, p. 272, dated 1779, Levi Sheftall is described as being "of Charles Town." I shall give an interesting notice of one of these brothers in my next article.

Of Michael Lazarus I know very little. He is in business on King st, on April 24, 1762. This is the only notice I have of him. I believe that the was the father of Marks Lazarus, whom we meet later, but I am not certain of this.

PHILIP HART.

Philip Hart, a native of Poland, was one of the officials of Bath Elohim. He was

also a merchant (S. C. G., May 30, 1761.) He was a partner in the business of Samuel Isaacs, too, at Georgetown, (S. C. G., Jan 17, 1761.)

I shall now proceed as far as possible chronologically. In the S. C. G. of Aug 17, 1752, we find an advertisement of Solomon Isaacs. We already met with him in 1745. He advertises again on April 24 and on Oct 9, 1755. He died before July 14, 1757, for in the Gazette of that date Peter Bacot advertises for the debts due to his estate. His will, proved Jan 14, 1757, mentions his newphew, Samson Simson, of New York, as one of his executors.

In the South Carolina Gazette of Aug 19, 1756, we have the first notice of Moses Lindo—the most conspicuous Jew in South Carolina in Provincial days. I have already written of him in detail, and, therefore, will only mention an exceedingly interesting reference to him in a contemporary diary: "Journal of a voyage to Charlestown in So Carolina, by Pelatiah Webster in 1765." Here is the entry:

"Monday, 3. Dined this day with Mr Thomas Liston, a reputable mercht born here; is a man of great openess & politeness, of generous sentiments & very genteel behaviour; passed the afternoon very agreably in his sumer house with him & Mr Lindo, a noted Jew, inspector of Indigo here."

LIEUT JOSEPH LEVY.

In the volume "Wills," 1754-8, p. 795, there is a "Commission from his Excellency to Joseph Levy to be Lieutenant of Captain Gaillard's Company in the said Regiment ut supra." (South Carolina Regiment of Foot under the command of Lieut Col Probart Howarth.) This commission is dated Sept 3, 1757.

In the S. C. G. of April 11, 1761, we read that "Lieut Levy is arrived at Congarees with 32 recruits for Col Middleton's Regi-

ment from North Carolina." This Lieut Levy was one of the officers in the South Carolina Regiment in the Cherokee war of 1760-1. A copy of his commission, dated Sept 23, 1760, is in the office of Mesne Conveyance here.

We meet with this Joseph Levy in the Gazettes. He advertises on November 13, 1762. His last advertisement appears in the S. C. G. of Aug 6, 1772.

In the S. C. G. of Oct 20, 1759, Isaac Levy makes a claim of title to lands in Savannah which have been announced for sale and gives notice to intending purchasers that they will buy lands without a clear title. He is going to petition his Majesty. On Nov 24, he publishes papers in proof of his own title. This Isaac Levy was a native of New York who lived for some years in England. The full story of this case and its sequel is told in a paper read before the American Jewish Historical Society by Dr Herbert Friedenwald. (Vol 9. pp. 57-62.)

In the Vol "Inventories," 1758-1763, p. 238, there is a document of Israel Levy, merchant of Charles Town, dated Nov 29, 1759.

In the S. C. G. of Dec 16, 1760, Isaac Pinto advertises as a wholesale wine merchant. He advertises also on Feb 21, 1761, and on Jan 23, 1762.

On Dec 11, 1762, we meet with Simon Hart.

On Sept 25, 1762, we meet with Imanuel Cortissoz. I believe that I found him earlier, but I did not recognize his name at the time.

In the Gazette of April 24, 1762, we first meet with Joshua Hart "on the Bay" He advertises steadily till April 28, 1777. On November 18, 1777, there is this notice:

SEIXAS-HART.

'The same day (Wednesday) Mr Abraham Mendez Sexias, of the State of Geor-

gia, was married to Miss Ritcey Hart, a young lady of the most amiable qualifications, daughter of Mr Joshua Hart, of this town."

This notice is interesting as an early example of inter-marriage between Portuguese and German Jews. Such intermarriages were by no means uncommon here in the early days. In later days they are exceedingly rare.

In the Gazette of Sept 10, 1763, we meet with Jacob Jacobs. He leaves for Savannah, but is back again on April 7, 1779.

On December 31, 1764, Dr Andrew Judah, a physician from London, advertises. His next advertisement states that he is from Holland. I am not certain whether he is a Jew.

In the Gazette of Aug 18, 1766, we read: "On Friday, on the ship Queen Charlotte, Capt Reeves, from London, arrived (among others) Mr Mordecai Sheftall (for Georgia) and the Rev Mr Alexander."

Who is this Rev Mr Alexander? He is possibly the Abraham Alexander who succeeded Isaac Da Costa as Reader of Beth Elohim, though Mr Levin in the "Occident" gives the date of his appointment as 1764. We cannot always accept the statements in the "Occident," however. The old writers were not so particular about a year or two and many of their successors seem to be equally indifferent as to dates. He served Beth Elohim without remuneration till 1784, when he resigned. In the Constitution of 1820 (Rule XX) it is directed that "the seventh "escaba" shall be made for Mr Abraham Alexander, sen, deceased, who volunteered his services to perform divine service." He, too, engaged in commercial pursuits and was highly respected in the community. He was one of the founders of Scottish Rite Masonry in Charleston. He died in 1816.

In M. C. Records, Vol M. M., 1765-7, p. 432, there is a deed of Solomon Levi. He mentions in it Bernard De Young. On p. 579, there is a promissory note of Henry Isaacs, dated June 18, 1765, and on p. 420 there is a deed of Isaac De Lyon, of Charles Town, dated June 11, 1766. The deed mentions Emanuel Abrahams, whom we meet with prominently later.

On Oct 27, 1766, amongst passengers arrived, are Mr Franks and daughter. In the Postscript to the Gazette of May 11, 1767, we meet with Philip Abraham and Samuel Nunez Cardozo. On June 1, 1767, we read that "On the 26th inst Mr Lopez and many other passengers embarked for Rhode Island." The Lopez family, however, did not settle in Charleston till after the Revolution. On July 6, 1767, Mr Joseph Jacobs arrived from Philadelphia and on Aug 3, we have mention of Francis Cohen. On Aug 1, 1771, Mordecai Myers advertises and again from Georgetown on Aug 25, 1772. On Sept 19, 1771 we meet with Myer Moses for the first time in the Gazettes, though he had been living here for some years. On November 1, 1772, there is mention made of Jacob Ramos and on December 6, 1773, we read the following exceedingly interesting notice:

FRANCIS SALVADOR ARRIVES.

"More than one hundred passengers are come in the vessels that have arrived here since our last. Amongst them: FRANCIS SALVADOR."

Picciotto in his "Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History," pp. 161-4, has given us a most interesting history of the Salvador family. Strange to say, we in Charleston know a great deal more about the later story of two of the most illustrious members of that distinguished family—Joseph and Francis Salvador—than he does. Picciotto seems to know nothing of their

later career. I will complete his narrative when I come to Joseph Salvador in the period after the Revolution.

Suffice it for the present to say that the wealthy family of Salvador was overwhelmed by two disastrous misfortunes, the earthquake at Lisbon and the failure of the Dutch East India Company. These calamities brought the Salvadors to the brink of ruin. Joseph Salvador was still possessed of lands in America—100,000 acres in Ninety Six District in South Carolina. In the M. C. Records F 4, p. 242, there is a power of attorney from Joseph Salvador, Esq. of the City of London, merchant, now being in the city of Bristol, to Richard Andrews Rapley, dated Sept 25th, 1769. This document recites that Joseph Salvador owns 100,000 acres of land in South Carolina, that squatters had settled upon some of it and that he is about to make a right, true and legal recovery of all rent or arrears of rent then already due and that might thereafter become due * * * and to keep others from obtaining possession in future, he gives the said Rapley, of the city of London, gentleman, (then on his departure into foreign parts,) his power of attorney to look after his affairs and authorizes him to sell some 45,000 acres. This deed is recorded in Charleston on Feb 14th, 1774.

In 1773, Francis Salvador, the nephew and son-in-law of Joseph Salvador, determined to come to South Carolina and we have seen that he arrived in Charleston in December of that year. The story related in Picciotto that Mrs Joshua Mendes Da Costa, the daughter of Joseph Salvador, gave up a part of her marriage settlement to furnish funds for Francis Salvador's expedition, is not probable, nor is it borne out by our records here.

On May 13, 1774, Francis Savador buys from Joseph Salvador per Richard An-

drews Rapley, his attorney, 5160 acres of land, for a consideration of £14,000 lawful money of South Carolina. (O 4, p .12.) On May 16 he buys 921 acres more (M 4, p. 256. On June 1 he buys 360 acres of land adjoining his, from Michell Duvall, (M 4, p. 282.)

On Feb 22, 1775, Joseph Salvador conveys a large tract of land to Rebecca Mendes Da Costa, widow, "to satisfy a judgment which the said Rebecca Mendes Da Costa had obtained against him." (T 4, p. 1.) and on March 8, 1775, Rebecca Mendes Da Costa sends to Francis Salvador, now in South Carolina, a letter of Attorney authorizing him to dispose of this land. (R 4, p. 430.) This transaction is apparently the basis of Picciotto's story, but had nothing to do with Francis Salvador's expedition, for he had been in South Carolina since Dec 1773.

A DISTINGUISHED CITIZEN.

Francis Salvador came to South Carolina in troublous times. The Revolution was brewing. Scarcely had he settled down when he threw himself heart and soul into the movement for independence. He came down to Charles Town as a Deputy from Ninety Six to the Provincial Congress of 1775, and such was the confidence that he inspired, that he was placed on several important committees. He was also a Deputy to the second Provincial Congress of 1775-6, the Congress which declared South Carolina an independent State. In July 1776, the Indians made a raid into Ninety Six District and murdered quite a number of the inhabitants. Col Andrew Williamson, commanding the Militia Regiment of Ninety Six District, collected his militia and proceeded against them and a detachment of regulars was sent from Charles Town to assist him.

Salvador seems to have been an aide to Col Williamson. At the battle which took place at Essenecca he met his tragic fate.

I cannot give a better description of his life and character than that given in the 2nd Vol of Drayton's "Memoirs," pp. 347-9, nor is there a better account of his death than that given by Col Williamson in his letter to W. H. Drayton, published in Gibbes's "Documents," (1764-1776, p. 125.) I would only point out that this letter is erroneously headed and dated in Gibbes. I will let Drayton speak for himself:

"He was the grandson of Francis Salvador, and the son of Jacob Salvador, of England, who died when his son Francis was about two years old. Shortly after his father's death, his mother gave birth to his brother, Moses, who is still living in The Hague, having married a daughter of the Baron Suasso. Both of these young gentlemen were liberally educated by a private tutor and the best master, and were taught those accomplishments suitable to their wealth and rank in life. Upon coming of age, each of them inherited £60,000 sterling, and Francis on his return from France, married his first cousin, Sarah Salvador, second daughter of Joseph Salvador, his uncle; receiving with her a portion of £13,000 sterling. Mr Francis Salvador, after this marriage, resided at Twickenham, near his mother and step-father, Abraham Prado, but having impaired his fortune by some unfortunate speculations, he came to South Carolina about the end of 1773, intending to settle here and have his wife, his son and three daughters from England with him, but his unfortunate death prevented their removal. * * * About the year 1774, Mr Francis Salvador purchased lands and negroes in South Carolina, and not wishing to live alone, he resided with his intimate friend, Richard A. Rapley, at Coro-

neka, commonly called Cornacre, in Ninety Six District. His manners were those of a polished gentleman, and as such he was intimately known and esteemed by the first Revolutionary characters in South Carolina. He also possessed their confidence in a great degree, as his literary correspondences with them sufficiently proves, and at the time of his death both he and his friend, Mr Rapley, were of the ten Representatives for Ninety Six District in the General Assembly of South Carolina. When the irruption of the savages brought distress upon his neighbours and one of their children sought refuge at his dwelling from the bloody tomahawk, his warm heart directed him to their relief. Against the savage foe he volunteered his services, and at the side of his friend Major Williamson, he received those wounds which sacrificed his life in the service of his adopted country."

From now on we meet with many new names. I have hitherto gone into very minute detail, and while my note-books contain practically exhaustive notices of nearly every individual whom I mention, no useful end would be served by complete references. Newspaper advertisements and mortgages are very much alike. I would call attention to this point, however, that there are very, very few men who lived in Charleston whom we will not meet in some connection or other in the records. I shall henceforth only mention names, save where there is occasion for special comment.

DIRECTORY 1770-1782.

Here, then, is a complete directory of the Jews whom I find in Charleston between the years 1770 and 1782:

Aaron, Solomon.

Abrahams, Emanuel.

Abrahams, Isaac Brisco.
Abrahams, Joseph.
Abrahams, Juda.
Abrahams, Levy.
Alexander, Abraham.
Cardozo, David Nunez.
Cohen, Abraham.
Cohen, Gershon.
Cohen, Is.
Cohen, Jacob.
Cohen, Moses.
Cohen, Philip.
Cohen, Philip Jacob.
Da Costa, Abraham.
Da Costa, Isaac, Sr.
Da Costa, Isaac, Jr.
Da Costa, Joseph.
Da Costa, Samuel.
De La Motta, Emanuel.
Delyon, Abraham.
Delyon, Isaac.
De Palacios, Joseph, Sr.
De Palacios, Joseph, Jr.
Eliazer, Moses.
Harris, Mordecai.
Harris, Moses.
Hart, Joshua
Hart, Philip.
Jacobs, Israel.
Jacobs, Jacob.
Jones, Samuel.
Joseph, Israel.
Lazarus, Marks.
Levi, Solomon.
Levy, Ezekiel.
Levy, Hart.
Levy, Michael.
Levy, Moses Sim.
Levy, Nathan.
Levy, Samuel.
Minis, Philip.
Mordecai, Samuel.
Moses, Abraham.
Moses, Barnart or Barnard, Sr.
Moses, Barnart, Jr.

Moses, Henry.
Moses, Jacob.
Moses, Myer or Meyer.
Moses, Philip.
Myers, Joseph.
Myers, Mordecai.
Pollock, Samuel. (?)
Pollock, Solomon, (?) (an express rider.)
Salomons, Myer.
Sarzedas, David.
Sasportas, Abraham.
Seixas, Abraham.
Sheftall, Levi.
Simons, Sampson.
Simons, Saul.
Solomo, Zadok. (?)
Solomons, Joseph.
Spitzer, Bernard Moses.
Tobias, Jacob.
Tobias, Joseph.
Tores, Benjamin.

To compile this list I have used every possible source of information, both here and in Columbia, viz: The various Gazettes, the records in the offices of Probate and Mesne Conveyance, the "Grant Books" and finally the tombstones in the old cemetery here. I have even incorporated some names of persons who have letters awaiting them at the postoffice. A few of these may not even have been residents of Charleston at all. There may be two or three who are not Jews and some, too, who were not here during the latter part of the Revolution. In all there are only 68 names. This paves the way for an intelligent discussion of the part played in the Revolution by the Jews of South Carolina and which I reserve for my next article.

THE DAGGETT PRTG CO. CHASN. S. C

THE JEWS OF SOUTH CAROLINA . . .

A Survey of the Records
at Present Existing in Charleston.

. . . BY . . .

Dr. BARNETT A. ELZAS,

Rabbi of K. K. Beth Elohim.

III

The Jews in the Revolution.

Reprinted from the Charleston News and Courier, March

The Jews of South Carolina...

III.

The Jews in the Revolution.

I have brought my story down to a most interesting period. To describe the part played by the Jews of South Carolina, or rather by the Jews of Charleston, for there is nothing in the records, with one or two exceptions, as far as I have been able to ascertain, of any other Jews of South Carolina who saw service in the field, is a task quite easy and yet difficult. Till now the story has not been written. A few traditional tales, distorted according as the imagination of the story-teller was more or less vigorous and still further distorted by the imagination of the editor, are all that we now possess. No attempt has hitherto been made to go to original sources. Hence it is that the list of traditional items that found their way into the scrappy notices in Leeser's "Occident" of fifty years ago have gone the rounds of the newspapers and the books, and have been so often repeated that they have come to be looked upon as narratives of fact. Read the story of the Jews of Charleston where you will, you will find nothing but the same old stories told over and over again. The trouble with all past writers without exception has been that they have made no attempt to ascertain the facts. Our present data

are all of them traditions which, while containing a germ of truth, are like all traditions, largely unreliable. This is strange in view of the fact that historical material in Charleston is so abundant that it it is possible to write the story of the Jews of Charleston in the eighteenth century in almost as complete detail and with the same historical accuracy that one could write their history of twenty years ago. The newspapers are here almost complete. The records are here almost complete. All the historian needs is to know where to look, how to look and for what to look. This will furnish him with the facts and these will testify quite as eloquently to the value of the Jew as a citizen, as the glittering generalities and the specious absurdities that have till now passed current as history. We are, it seems to me, far enough removed from the scene to view the story in its true perspective. I shall continue, as before, to let the records as far as possible speak for themselves.

THE JEW A GOOD CITIZEN.

If it be the verdict of history that the Jew has been an important factor in the material development of every country in which he has lived, it is equally true that he has everywhere manifested his appreciation of the protection and freedom which have been vouchsafed to him by his willingness to bear the full burdens of citizenship even to the extent of ungrudgingly laying down his life in his country's defence. One needs no better illustration of Jewish patriotism than the story of the Jews of South Carolina. To appreciate the part that the Jews of this State played in the Revolution, however, one must possess an adequate knowledge of the history of South Carolina as well as a knowledge of the local field. Without this

local knowledge one can at best only evolve a more or less imaginative picture from his inner consciousness—an unworthy performance in these days of scientific attainment and honest research. But to come back to the story.

In my last article I printed a list, which I am satisfied is practically exhaustive, of all the Jews who were in Charleston between 1770 and 1782. I omitted a couple of names of men who, like Moses Lindo, died prior to 1775. In all there were 68 names. I would leave my readers under an entirely wrong impression, however, if I did not give them some further information about this list, information that will change the aspect of this number materially.

Of these 68 names I am morally certain that one at least is not a Jew—Solomon Pollock. He was an express rider in the country and I obtained his name from a Revolutionary "indent" in Columbia. I have my doubts also about Moses Harris. Mordecai Myers belongs to Georgetown and is only here at the latter part of the Revolution. So does Abraham Cohen, though he was in the militia of Charleston during the siege. Ezekiel Levy has a letter waiting for him at the postoffice on April 21, 1773, which is still there on July 9. He probably does not belong here at all. Mordecai Harris should be stricken from my list. His name appears on a petition printed in the South Carolina and American General Gazette for November 26, 1778. This petition is half destroyed and I have since discovered is a Georgia petition. The name of Joseph Solomon should be added. Benjamin Tores did not come here till 1782. What has more bearing on our discussion, however, is the fact that of this number no less than 21 do not appear in Charleston prior to 1779. Many of them came from Savannah in that year.

Some came still later. Here is the list:

Abrahams, Joseph.
De La Motta, Emanuel.
De Lyon, Abraham.
De Lyon, Isaac.
De Palacios, Joseph.
Jacobs, Jacob.
Levy, Hart.
Levy, Michael.
Levy, Samuel
Minis, Philip.
Moses, Barnart.
Moses, Jacob.
Moses, Philip.
Myers, Joseph.
Pollock, Samuel.
Sasportas, Abraham.
Seixas, Abraham.
Sheftall, Levi.
Simons, Sampson.
Simons, Saul.
Spitzer, Bernard Moses.

Joshua Hart left Charleston in 1779 and did not return until 1784, when he makes an announcement to his old friends and customers. Bernard Moses Spitzer likewise leaves for the West Indies in that year. It must not be forgotten, too, that there were Jews at this time in Georgetown, Camden, Black Mingo and Beaufort, whose names appear in Charleston from time to time. With this preliminary explanation the way is now clear for a better understanding of our inquiry.

THE STATUS IN 1775-6.

I will now very briefly indicate the position of South Carolina in the Revolution. This is necessary for a correct understanding of what follows. I shall make no attempt at fine writing, as my entire concern is to bring out the facts.

South Carolina was a favored colony. She had none of the grievances, e. g. of Massachusetts. Her trade with the

mother country was large. Her agricultural products were sold at good prices to England and her industries were fostered by generous bounties on the part of the home Government. Her only grievance was the question of "home rule" and that question was of little concern to the people at large. The only aggrieved ones were the intellectual and ambitious classes and with such a commercial population could scarcely be expected to be in sympathy. The masses were naturally hostile to a revolution which threatened to disturb the quiet progress of a trade of which, having interests unlike those of New England, they had nothing to complain.

The population of South Carolina, too, was a very mixed one. South Carolina was an English colony and the English are by nature loyal. So are the Scotch and they were numerous. The foreign settlers were opposed to the Revolution, and it is only what is to be expected, therefore, that public opinion in South Carolina should have been well divided.

Not that the sentiments of the masses were always known. To use a homely illustration: A merchant to-day, if he is wise, does not go out of his way to proclaim his political views to every customer that enters his store. He could talk freely with far more impunity to-day than he could have spoken at the beginning of the Revolution. The commercial population simply watched the course of events, awaited developments and later on showed unmistakably where they stood. These facts are forcibly set forth in two brilliant articles from the pen of W. Gilmore Simms in the July and October numbers of the Southern Quarterly Review for 1848—articles which ought to be read and read again by all who are interested in the history of South Carolina.

Jews are proverbially loyal to the ruling Power. As was the case with the rest of the population, Jewish sentiment was divided. We shall see later that there were a number of Jews whose sentiments were known to be Pro-British. The number of Jews who served in the field, however and who rendered other service to the Revolutionary cause—in proportion to their total number—was phenomenally large. Of this the records leave no doubt.

THE MILITIA LAWS.

Before referring to these records, however, it would be well to glance at the militia system of South Carolina at the outbreak of and during the Revolution. I shall only take note of pertinent points.

Every man between the ages of 16 and 60 who was able to bear arms was compelled to enroll himself in some militia company. Prior to 1775 he could enroll himself in any company he pleased, but subsequent to November 20, 1775, he could only enroll himself in the district of the regiment to which he belonged. (S. C. G. November 23, 1775.)

By a resolution of the Provincial Congress, dated June 17, 1775, volunteer companies of not less than fifty might organize themselves into a company of foot, choosing their own officers. (Supplement to S. C. G. September 7, 1775.)

By the Act of 1778 a company consisted of 60 men. (Statutes of South Carolina. Vol 9, p 667.)

In the same Act is it further enacted: "That there shall not be formed any volunteer company in this State after the passing of this Act." * * * (Ibid p 667.)

The duties of a militiaman were "to appear completely armed once in every fortnight for muster, train and exercise," to do patrol duty and to be drafted for a limited time—usually 30 or 60 days accord-

ing to the season of the year, when deemed necessary by the Governor or Commander-in-Chief. (Ibid. See also Gazette of the State of South Carolina March 10, 1779.)

A man could furnish a substitute and thus be himself exempt from militia duty. S. C. G. March 10, 1778.)

Amongst those exempt from military service are clergymen and teachers. (Statutes of South Carolina, Vol 9, p 629.)

And here I would remark that it would seem that these militia laws were not very carefully observed. I find one presentment after another of the grand juries calling attention to their neglect. I would likewise point out that every man was not physically able to do military duty. Many were excused. Moultrie himself tells us this in referring to those who surrendered after the siege.

* * * "This threat brought out the aged, the timid, the disaffected and the infirm, many of them who had never appeared during the whole siege. * * * I saw the column march out and was surprised to see it so large; but many of them we had excused from age and infirmities." (Memoirs, Vol 2, pp 108-9.)

We can now proceed intelligently to deal with the records. These records are by no means as incomplete as we have hitherto thought. We have so many side sources of information that I may claim that it is possible to present a picture of the part that the Jews of South Carolina played in the Revolution with almost absolute fidelity. We must, however, dismiss completely the fictions of the early writers.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION.

What are these side sources of information? We have first of all the record and pension office and the bureau of pensions

at Washington; we have a vast number of Revolutionary records in this State. There is that wonderful Emmet Collection in the New York Public Library. There are a number of contemporary diaries available to us. There are the tombstones in our cemetery, and lastly the files of the newspapers, which rarely fail to mention military services in the obituary notices of deceased patriots. We have seen what Jews were here during the Revolution. We shall soon see what a large portion of them we can account for. Let us now proceed with the story, which is plain sailing.

The first real fighting in which the Charles Town militia were called into service—but the Charles Town militia took no part in the fight—was the battle of Fort Moultrie in June, 1776. Fort Moultrie was garrisoned by South Carolina regulars and the battle was fought by them alone. Of course the militia were in service in Charles Town, but they took no part in the engagement. There were quite a number of Jews in the Charles Town militia. Who they were I shall tell later. There do not appear to have been any Jews amongst the South Carolina regulars.

The result of the battle of Fort Moultrie was to insure undisturbed peace to South Carolina from June, 1776, to May, 1779. Trade went on pretty much as usual. The people married and gave in marriage, and beyond internal dissensions on account of the Loyalists there is nothing to be noted of interest.

LUSHINGTON'S COMPANY.

Between 1776 and 1778 Richard Lushington was promoted to be captain in the Charles Town regiment of militia. His company included nearly all of the Jews of Charles Town who fought in the Revolution, and that for reasons we have al-

ready seen. Soldiers had to enroll themselves in the district in which they lived. Richard Lushington's district extended on King street, from Broad street to Charles Town Neck—the modern Calhoun street. King street was then as now a principal business street and most of the Jews had their stores there. I could give the list of Jews who lived on King street, but this would serve no useful purpose. Of the names of Lushington's company that have come down to us I have in a former article pointed out, the Jewish names are in a decided minority.

Lushington's company took part in several engagements. It fought in the battle of Beaufort in February, 1779. Here Joseph Solomon was killed. (Gazette of the State of South Carolina. March 10, 1779.) The Charles Town militia likewise took part in the attempt to recapture Savannah in the same year. Here David Nunez Cardozo distinguished himself. (See inscription on his tombstone here, also obituary notice in the Charleston Courier of July 10, 1835.)

That the Jews both of Charles Town and Savannah had done their full duty to the patriot cause is attested by a splendid piece of uncontradicted contemporary testimony.

AN EXTRAORDINARY LETTER.

I remember listening some twenty years ago—long before I left England—to a powerful Jewish sermon on the subject of "How Shall we Answer Calumny?" The preacher referred to the over-sensitiveness of Jews and their tendency to rush into print whenever any allusion was made to them which might be construed into a real or imaginary offence. He warned his hearers that we Jews should be careful not to manifest irritation at the writings

of every anonymous scribbler. If the defence becomes perpetuated, so does the attack. He illustrated his theme by a reference to the book of Josephus against Apion. This blundering ignoramus would never have been heard of but for Josephus's reply. I was forcibly reminded of both the sermon and the illustration when I came across the following letter in the South Carolina and American General Gazette of December 3, 1773. Mrs Crouch's paper containing the libel is no longer in existence, and while the attack has come down to us by reason of the reply, we have in this instance at least no cause to regret it. The style of the letter is quaint, but its contents are telling. Here it is:

MR WELLS,

On perusing Mrs Crouch and Co's paper of the 1st instant, I was extremely surprised to find, in a piece signed AN AMERICAN, a signature sufficient to lead every honest and judicious man to imagine, that whatever was said in so publick a manner, should be ingenuous and true, assertions directly contrary. Here are his words:

"Yesterday being by my business posted in a much frequented corner of this town, I observed, in a small space of time, a number of chairs and loaded horses belonging to those who journeyed, come into town.—Upon inspection of their faces and enquiry, I found them to be of the TRIBE OF ISRAEL—who, after taking every advantage in trade the times admitted of in the State of Georgia, as soon as it was attacked by an enemy, fled here for an asylum, with their ill-got wealth—dastardly turning their backs upon the country when in danger, which gave them bread and protection—Thus it will be in this State if it should ever be assailed by our enemies—Let judgment take place."

I am apt to think, Mr Printer, that the gentleman is either very blind, or he is willing to make himself so: for I am well convinced, had he taken the trouble of going closer to the chairs, he would have found that what he has thus publickly asserted was erroneous and a palpable mistake, as he might have been convinced they were of the female kind, with their dear babes, who had happily arrived at an asylum, where a tyrannical enemy was not at theirs or their dear offsprings heels. I do, therefore, in vindication of many a worthy Israelite now in Georgia, assert, that there is not, at this present hour, a single Georgia Israelite in Charles Town; and that so far to the contrary of that gentleman's assertion, I do declare to the Publick, that many merchants of that State were here on the 22d ult, and on being informed of the enemy landing, they instantly left this, as many a worthy Gentile knows, and proceeded post haste to Georgia, leaving all their concerns unsettled, and are now with their brother citizens in the field, doing that which every honest American should do.

The truth of this assertion will, in the course of a few days, be known to gentlemen of veracity, who are entitled to the appellation of Americans. The Charlestown Israelites, I bless Heaven, hitherto have behaved as staunch as any other citizens of this State, and I hope their further conduct will be such as will invalidate the malicious and designing fallacy of the author of the piece alluded to.

I am, Sir, Yours, etc,

A real AMERICAN,

and

True hearted ISRAELITE.

Charleston, Wednesday, December 2, 1778.

We next meet with Lushington's company at the siege of Charles Town in 1780. Here our information concerning the Jews who fought in the militia is most complete. The original papers of Gen Lincoln, who was in command of the American army in South Carolina in 1780, are still in existence and are to be seen in the "Emmet Collection" in the New York Public Library. Appreciating the value of this priceless collection, our Ex-Mayor Courtenay, whose services in preserving and rendering available rare documents relating to South Carolina cannot be overestimated by our people, and with him our present Mayor J. Adger Smyth, incorporated many valuable documents from this collection, relating to the siege of Charlestown, into the "Year Book" for 1897. Three of these documents are especially interesting in our investigation.

JEWS IN THE SIEGE.

The defence of Charles Town is unique in the history of beleaguered cities. That it withstood a siege of two months against such overwhelming odds must excite the admiration of all who read the story. Its doom was sealed from the first, but not until provisions had given out and all the ammunition was practically spent; not until the British were within twenty yards of the American lines, and every hope of assistance was cut off, was there ever a thought of surrender. But the inevitable came at last. All hope being gone and further resistance being impossible, to avoid a useless slaughter the principal inhabitants of Charles Town and a number of the country militia petitioned Gen Lincoln to surrender. These petitions have came down to us and on them are many Jewish names. There are three lists—one of civilians containing 300

names appended, including many Jews, another of country militia with 111 names, but no Jews, and a third, of country militia, with 345 names appended, including many Jews. I reproduce the two petitions that contain the names of Jews with their fac simile signatures. One of these signers, Joseph Myers (?)—the name is illegible—it will be seen, tries to make "his mark" in script Hebrew. From his Hebrew signature "Joseph," he appears to be almost as illiterate in that language as he was in English. I am indebted to Mayor Smyth for his courtesy in permitting these reproductions and for the loan of the cuts. Here, then, are the petitions:

PETITIONS TO GEN LINCOLN.

I.

To the Honorable Major General Lincoln—

The Humble petition of divers Inhabitants of Charleston in behalf of themselves and others, their fellow citizens—

Sheweth

That your petitioners being inform'd the difficulties that arose in the Negotiation yesterday, and the day preceding, related wholly to the Citizens, to whom the British Commanders offer'd their estates, and to admit them to their parole as Prisoners of War; and your petitioners understanding it is an indisputable proposition, that they can derive no advantage by a perseverance in resistance; with every thing that is dear to them at stake, they think it their Indispensable duty, in this perilous situation of affairs, to request your Honor will send out a flag, in the name of the people, in timating their acquiescence in the terms propounded.

Charleston, 10th May, 1780.

(Three hundred names are attached to this petition. Among them are:)

Markes Lazarus.
Solomon Aaron.
Philip Minis.
Is Da Costa, Jr.
Joseph Solomons (x.)
Gershon Cohen.
Jacob Jacobs.
Zadok Solomo?
Meyer Moses.
Joseph de Palacios.
Philip Hart.
David Sarzedas.
Abraham Moses.
Joseph De Palacios.
Joseph Myers (x)

II.

To the Honorable Major General Lincoln

The Humble petition of divers Country Militia on behalf of themselves and others their fellow citizens—

Sheweth

That your petitioners being inform'd the difficulties that arose in the negotiation yesterday and the day preceding related wholly to the Citizens to whom the British commanders offered their estates and to admit them to their parole as prisoners of war, and your petitioners understanding it as an indisputable proposition that they can derive no advantage from a perserverance in resistance, with every thing that is dear to them at stake, they think it their indispensable duty in this perilous situation of affairs, to request your Honor will send out a Flag in the name of the people intimating their acquiescence in the terms proposed.—

To the Honorable Major General Lincoln

The Humble Petition of divers Inhabitants of Charlestown in behalf of themselves, & others their fellow Citizens.

Sweetly

Tho' your petitioners being informed the difficulties that arose in the Negotiation yesterday, and the day preceding, related wholly to the Citizens, to whom the British Commanders offered their Estates, and to admit them to their Parole as Prisoners of War; and your petitioners understanding this an indisputable proposition, that they can derive no advantage by a perseverance in resistance; with every thing that is dear to them at Stake, they think it their Indispensable duty, in this perilous situation of affairs, to request your Honor will send out a Flag, in the name of the people, intimating their acquiescence in the terms propounded yesterday.

Charlestown 11th May 1780 —

Markus Lazarus
Solomon Aaron
Gershom Cohen
Phil Phillips
Isaac Seixas
Ladoc Lazarus
Abraham Moses
Jos. Da Costa Jr.
Moses Moses
Moses De Fonseca
Joseph Solomons his mark
Joseph Nelson
Joseph his mark Myers

To the Honourable Major General Lincoln

The Humble Petition of Twenty Country Merchants on behalf of themselves and others Jews & Citizens

Sir

That your Petitioners being informed of the difficulties that arose in the negotiation yesterday and the day preceding on account of the Citizens to whom the British Commander offered their estates and admittance to their parole as prisoners of war and your Petitioners understanding it as an indisputable proposition that they can derive no advantage from a persevering in resistance, with every thing that is dear to them at stake, they think it their indispensable duty in this perilous situation of affairs to request your Honor will send out a Flag in the name of the people intimating their disposition in the terms proposed

Philip Moses
Abraham Cohen
Jacob Mole
Judah Abrahams
Moses Cohen
Meyer Salomon
Barnard Mordecai Junr
Hans Harris
Philip Dexter Chess
Sam Mordecai

(Here are appended the names of Field-officers and men—in all 345 names, amongst which are the following:)

Philip Moses.
Abraham Cohen.
Myer Salomons.
Moses Harris (?)
Philip Jacob Cohen.
Jacob Moses.
Juda Abrahams.
Moses Cohen.
Emanuel Abrahams.
Samuel Polak.
Samuel Jones.
Barnard Moses, Junr.
I. Cohen.
Samuel Mordecai.

OTHER JEWISH SOLDIERS.

We have on this last petition the names of 13 and possibly of 14 Charles Town Jews who served in the militia during the siege. There are several others whose names have come down to us.

Marks Lazarus, who is apparently a civilian, in May 1780, saw service in 1778, 1779 and 1780. He was a sergeant major. I have before me a copy of his war record from the bureau of pensions. (See also obituary notice in the "Southern Patriot" of November 7, 1825.) He was afterwards one of the petitioners to Clinton.

David Nunez Cardoza was also a sergeant major. I have already referred to him. His obituary notice informs us that "he marched with the Grenadier corps from Charleston to the Lines before Savannah, and as first non-commissioned officer of Capt Boquet's company, volunteered and led the Forlorn Hope in the assault on the British lines."

Abraham Seixas was a captain of militia here, but fought as a lieutenant in the Continental line in Georgia. He went to

Philadelphia in 1782, but returned to Charleston later.

Joseph Solomon we have already seen was killed at the battle of Beaufort.

Jacob Cohen we are told in the "Diary of Josiah Smith, Jr," was "one of the prisoners on parole, that were sent on board the prison ship Torbay and Schooner Pack Horse, the 17th of May, 1781." It is worthy of note that his name is not mentioned in any of the lists of these prisoners in Garden, Moultrie, Ramsay, Drayton, Gibbes or McCrady.

Of Jacob I. Cohen, who is referred to by all writers, I have till now found no mention in any of the records here. Nor have I found anything with reference to Capt Jacob De Leon, or Capt Jacob De La Motta, of Charleston, who are supposed to have fought at the battle of Camden. I would like to have some authority for the story that these men together with Major Nones carried off the wounded De Kalb from the field. It is strange that none of the contemporary writers mention it. It is remarkable, too, that Lossing, who has preserved so many traditions in his "Field Book of the Revolution"—and he is particularly gossippy in his story of this battle—should know nothing about it.

The names I have mentioned are all that I have till now been able to discover in the records. There may be some more that I may yet find, but these will not be many. It would be unreasonable to expect it. An entire population never fights, but those who don't fight or who are physically unable to fight—and these will always form a goodly portion of a population—are able to render other service that is equally valuable. As a matter of fact, during the siege of Charleston, the trouble was not the lack of men. All the early writers have noted the fact that had there been more men, the only purpose they

could have served would have been to make provisions scarce in a shorter time. Of men who rendered good service to the American cause and who were not fighters we have also documentary evidence.

PATRIOTIC CIVILIANS.

In the North American Review for July, 1826, p 73, Isaac Harby referring to the Jews in the Revolution writes: "My maternal grandfather contributed pecuniary aid to South Carolina, and particularly to Charleston, when besieged by the British. My father-in-law was a brave grenadier in the regular American army, and fought and bled for the liberty he lived to enjoy, and to hand down to his children." The maternal grandfather of Isaac Harby was Meyer Moses and his father-in-law was Samuel Mordecai. To the services rendered by Meyer Moses Gen Sumter testified in after years in a letter to Franklin J. Moses, a grandson of the Jewish patriot, who had died in 1787. There were, and I believe still are, in Columbia the original letter and a testimonial from Gen Sumter of similar purport. I reproduce only the latter:

South Mount, October 11, 1831.

I certify that I was well acquainted with Myer Moses, Esq. Merchant in Charleston. So. Ca. I understood and believed that he was friendly and attached to the American cause during the Revolution. I further understood and believe that his treatment to the American wounded and prisoners were such as to entitle him to the good wishes and gratitude of all those who had the success of the Revolution at heart. After the fall of Charleston his treatment to the wounded and prisoners who were taken and sent to Charleston was extremely friendly and humane, they being in the greatest possible distress.

Moreover I have understood and believed that on these occasions he expended a considerable sum in relieving them.

(Signed) Thos Sumter.

Mordecai Myers, of Georgetown, was another man who furnished supplies to the American army. (See Gibbes's "Documents," (1781-2,) pp 182-3. See, however, also Gibbes (1778-1782,) p 166, "Gen Marion to Col P. Horry.")

LOYALISTS IN CHARLESTON.

I have already referred in this article, to the division of sentiment that existed among the population of South Carolina and of Charleston at the outbreak of and during the Revolution. The Gazettes print the names of some who "embarked under an unhappy delusion" for other parts. (See list in Gazette of the State of South Carolina for July 8, 1778.) We read of many who "left the State to join the enemies thereof." (Ibid November 24, 1779.) Charleston, in fact, was full of British sympathizers—witness the large lists of petitioners to Clinton, of addressors of Cornwallis and of Clinton and Arburthnot. In conversation with Moultrie, after the surrender, Capt Rochfort, a British officer, remarked: "Sir, you have made a gallant defence, but you had a great many rascals among you who came out every night and gave us information of what was passing in your garrison." (Moultrie's Memoirs, Vol 2, p 108.) Many at first, naturally enough, were very careful as to how they betrayed their real sentiments. When Charleston surrendered, however, they did not hesitate to show what their sentiments really were, others thinking that South Carolina would finally remain a British province, and hoping to save their property, sincerely returned to their allegiance. Still others were by necessity compelled to accept British pro-

tection. (See Ramsay's South Carolina, pp 129 et seq.)

Referring to the Jewish merchants, Ramsay remarks that: "While prisoners, they were encouraged to make purchases from the British merchants who came with the conquering army, and after they had contracted large debts of this kind, were precluded by proclamation from selling the goods they had purchased, unless they assumed the name and character of British subjects." (Ibid.) This could only have been the case with a minority. The majority did not take protection or swear allegiance, but left Charles Town after the surrender.

PETITIONS TO CLINTON.

About August or September, 1780, many citizens of Charles Town presented a petition to the Commandant setting forth "that they were very desirous to show every mark of allegiance and attachment to his Majesty's person and Government, to which they were most sincerely well affected, and, therefore, humbly prayed that they might have an opportunity to evince the sincerity of their professions." This petition was referred to "gentlemen of known loyalty and integrity, as well as knowledge of the persons and characters of the inhabitants, in order to report the manner in which the Memorialists had heretofore conducted themselves." This committee reported favorably in the cases of 166 citizens, including the following Jews:

Joseph Myers.
Saul Simons.
Abraham Alexander.
Moses Eliezer.
Philip Cohen.
Marcus Lazarus.
Philip Moses.

(The Royal South Carolina Gazette, September 21, 1780.)

Of these Marcus (Marks) Lazarus and Philip Moses had been soldiers in the war, and for some or other reason now swore allegiance. Abraham Alexander was the minister of Beth Elohim and the Synagogue constitution of 1820, (Rule XIX,) tells us that Rabbi Moses Eleizar was "a learned man in the laws of God. and until his death had taught the youth of this congregation and manifested unremitted zeal to promote religion in this country." There is no evidence to show and no reason for supposing that these men were not expressing their real convictions when they signed the petition to Sir Henry Clinton. It is worthy of note that in a subsequent petition for protection of 211 citizens, published in the Royal Gazette of July 11, 1781, nothing is said about the petition being referred to a committee of citizens of known loyalty and integrity, etc. In this second petition such a reference was unnecessary. The petitioners had been admittedly Anti-British.

The Royal Gazette and the Royal South Carolina Gazette, published during the period of British occupation, show the following Jews as doing business here during that period:

Joseph Abrahams.
Jacob Jacobs.
Delyon and Moses
Isaac Delyon.
Gershon Cohen.
Emanuel Abrahams.
Abraham Cohen.
Abraham Da Costa.

Of these Emanuel Abrahams and Abraham Cohen had fought in the war. All of these men, however, must either have taken protection after the surrender or have been known to have been well affected or at least not openly hostile to the British cause. Most of them had been doing business here right along since 1779.

Those whose sentiments were known to have been hostile were sought out by the British and banished. Amongst these was Isaac Da Costa, Sr, whose estates we have seen were promptly seized and confiscated by the British and himself banished. We have likewise seen Jacob Cohen put on board the prison ship.

Isaac Delyon was a known Tory and his property was amerced after the Revolution. He came here in 1779. There would doubtless have been other amercements, but the records do not show any wealth among the Jews who remained here in business during the period of British occupation. Levi Sheftall was likewise a Loyalist. Be it ever remembered, however, that there was as much true patriotism in the Loyalist as there was in the most ardent Revolutionist.

In my search in Columbia I examined many thousands of "indents," or certificates entitling the holder to payment of sums due for services rendered in the war. There was not a single one made out in favor of a Jew. The date of these indents explained the reason. They were all for services rendered subsequent to 1780. After May, 1780, the Charles Town militia were prisoners on parole and very few afterwards took the field. Some did, but there was a special reason in their case. We know what became of the Jewish population.

THE MAJORITY STEADFAST.

Most of the Jewish merchants did not and would not take protection, but left for Philadelphia after the surrender of Charles Town, and in 1782 we find 10 Charles Town Jews in the list of original members of the Mickveh Israel Congregation. There were other Jews, doubtless, who do not appear on the list. (See Morais "Jews of Philadelphia," p 15.) The ten

names I refer to are those of Isaac Da Costa, Sr, Isaac Da Costa, Jr, Samuel Da Costa, Philip Moses, Israel Jacobs, Jacob Cohen, Ezekiel Levy, Abraham Sasportas, Abraham Seixas and Solomon Aaron. These men came back afterwards when peace was restored. So much, then, for the evidence of the records.

I must now say a word about the traditional story. The most careful investigation has failed to reveal the large number of Jews who are supposed to have borne arms in the Revolution. Men who write history ought to have some sense of proportion. I believe that my list is practically exhaustive and that I am perfectly safe in asserting that never at any time during the Revolution were there 60 Jews in Charleston between the ages of 15 and 60. It is highly improbable that there were 50, and of these, of course, many did not fight. This we know positively.

There is another way, however, in which we arrive at the same conclusion. We are told that in 1791 Beth Elohim Congregation consisted of 53 families, numbering upwards of 400 persons. So complete has been my investigation that if I desired to do so I could enumerate these and go even into the details of their family history. We know who came here after the Revolution, when they came here and where they came from. By this double method of calculation the chances of error are reduced to very narrow limits. Three or four names may yet be brought to light and perhaps as many who served in the militia, but more than this number I do not believe will ever be found.

TRADITIONS UPSET.

But how about the company of Jews which is referred to by every past writer and the company of volunteers commanded by Capt Richard Lushington and organized in 1779? Prior to 1779, in which

year, as we have seen, there was a large accession from Savannah, a company composed entirely or almost entirely of Jews is a manifest impossibility. A company of volunteers in 1779 is likewise an impossibility, in view of the Act of 1778, which declared that "there shall not be formed any volunteer company in this State after the passing of this Act." This is surely conclusive. Of Lushington's company we have information from several sources. He must have commanded about 60 men. Several rolls of militia companies are in existence and they all contain about this number and the Act itself prescribes this number as a company. I have the names of over 20 Non-Jews in his command. This speaks for itself.

It is easy enough to account for the tradition in this case. We have seen that nearly all the Jews of Charleston who fought, fought in Lushington's command. We have seen also the reason of this. From the number of Jews in this company it got the name of the "Jew Company." Forty years afterwards, time enough for legend and fancy to have had full play, we find the writers and speakers--and there was some excuse for them—referring to Lushington's company of Jews. In furnishing material for a plea for toleration for the Jews of Maryland a little exaggeration was pardonable, particularly in the early days, but there is no such excuse for men who undertake to write history. Historians do not incorporate news paper clippings into their work without investigation, nor do such newspaper clippings even when used in debate become authoritative sources of reference. Such "authorities" are good enough for men who only use second-hand sources of information in their work and who undertake to write a hundred years of history in as many minutes. It is not to the

credit of our time that such superficial work is received with approbation.

Need I say anything about that other statement—the "remarkable fact" that nearly all the Jews who served on the field served as officers? It is on the face of it so puerile that I will not even discuss it. With the exception of Capt Seixas, there were a few non-commissioned officers, but these are only officers by courtesy. A company of Jews—and nearly all officers! Kentucky is not as original as we have been led to believe.

And is not the tale that the facts unfold glorious enough? The Jews of South Carolina furnished the Revolution with Francis Salvador, one of its most trusted leaders. In proportion to their numbers they furnished at least as many men as did their neighbors and gave as freely of their means to the cause. I claim no more, but is it not enough?

THE DAGGETT PRTG CO. CHASN. S. C.

THE JEWS OF SOUTH CAROLINA . . .

A Survey of the Records
at Present Existing in Charleston.

. . . BY . . .

Dr. BARNETT A. ELZAS,

Rabbi of K. K. Beth Elohim.

IV

1783—1800.

(Reprinted from the Charleston News and Courier, Ma

The Jews of South Carolina...

IV.

1783—1800.

[Reprinted from The News and Courier.]

With the present article I bring my sketches of the Jews of South Carolina to an end. The most interesting part of the story remains yet to be told. I am reserving that for my book, which I hope to see published next year. It will take me many months of patient work, however, before I can sift and digest the almost endless material that I have gathered during the last eight years. To collate carefully the long-lost records of K. K. Beth Elohim is of itself a formidable task.

Before proceeding to-day, however, I regret that I have again to pay a little attention to the notable Huhner, of New York. I thought that I had done with him, but he is apparently very dissatisfied. I begrudge the space that I am giving up to him, for he is literally incorrigible. There are some, however, who are interested in this matter, who keep newspaper clippings, and who may happen to have preserved that gentleman's "last word" in the American Hebrew. (P 493.) For them I propose to keep the record straight, Huhner and the American Hebrew notwithstanding. I do not propose either to allow the impression to be given that my criticism was in any way unfair or unwarranted.

Of the twenty undeniable mistakes of fact in Mr Huhner's thousand-word article he selects eight in which he imagines he has a good defence. He even undertakes to correct our ignorance. We shall see how well he succeeds. I shall refer to his statements in the order in which they are made in his "last word:"

First. As to Myer Moses. Says Mr Huhner: "Nowhere, either in the Year Book for 1886 or in the Statutes, do we find Jr after Mr Moses's name, and the name is invariably found as Myer, not Meyer, as Mr Salley has it." Mr Huhner is right. The writer in the year book does not add Jr to the name, nor had he any occasion to do so. Had he dreamt, however, that the time might come when Mr Huhner would undertake to write on the history of South Carolina and make a man who had died in 1787 either a member of the Legislature in 1810, or a Commissioner of Education in 1812, he would doubtless have added this landmark and other information for his guidance, but unfortunately he was not to know this. As for the spelling "Meyer," which Mr Huhner thinks is invariably "Myer," it is interesting to observe that the father wrote his own name "Meyer Moses"—I published his autograph signature recently—and in the office of mesne conveyance here, where the deeds are supposed to be true copies of the originals, the name of the son is never spelt in any other way.

Mr Huhner next proceeds to enlighten us as to what is meant when "we" speak of board of education, and claims again that the Act of 1811 was the beginning of the public school system as such in South Carolina. "This is the view," says Mr Huhner, "taken by all writers of importance." This is Mr Huhner, but not fact. McCrady will certainly be accepted as a

writer of importance on matters relating to South Carolina; indeed, this distinguished author has given us the most comprehensive study on this subject that has till now appeared. Let the student read McCrady's essay on "Education in South Carolina" in Volume 4 of the Collections of the South Carolina Historical Society, and he will find overwhelming proof that the public school system of South Carolina was a gradual evolution and that the Act of 1811 merely modified the system that had been in existence uninterruptedly for over 100 years. In this essay, which was considered of sufficient importance to be reproduced by the United States Bureau of Education, McCrady mercilessly exposes the superficiality of McMaster and no one familiar with the literature of the history of South Carolina would to-day think of quoting that writer as an authority. Such authorities are good enough for historical scribblers and historical "incorporators," but we have a right to demand better knowledge of the sources from men who write in encyclopaedias and who proclaim themselves specialists.

With reference to Moses Lindo, Mr Huhner can only repeat what he said in his first letter, as though repeating what he said in his first letter would alter the fact that he had stated in his paper that Moses Lindo was "among those who were in the army," or that "Inspector General for South Carolina," as he calls him in his article in the Encyclopaedia, is meaningless except as a military title.

Mr Huhner again tangles himself up with Salvador. In his article Mr Huhner informed us that Salvador was a member of the "Colonial Assembly" as early as 1774. I will not go over the ground again—it seems to be too much for him—but will merely point out that not a

single one of Mr Huhner's authorities show him to be a member of any body earlier than 1775. Perhaps Mr Huhner's mind can take so much in.

Mr Huhner next tells how it came to pass that he knew nothing about Jewish Tories in Charleston. Though the Petition to Clinton is referred to by McCrady, that author does not specifically mention the Jewish names, nor are they given in any of Mr Huhner's books, so that it is unfair to say that he ought to have known about them. He knew that Sabine's "Loyalists" mentioned Isaac Delyon; he knew that Isaac Delyon had been amerced as a citizen of South Carolina, but further research (sic) convinced him that the individual mentioned belonged to Georgia! "Mr Salley is in error," he says, "in concluding that Isaac Delyon belonged to Charleston. He probably had some property there, but that was all. The authorities mentioned by Mr Salley do not refer to a South Carolina Tory." (!) Mr Huhner is really funny, though he does not seem to possess a very keen sense of humor. Mr Salley, of course, knew what he was writing about—Mr Huhner makes the story up as he goes along. Isaac Delyon became a resident of Charles Town early in 1779. He advertises regularly in the Gazettes for many years, at first in partnership with Barnart Moses, then in business by himself. The deeds—and there are many of them in the office of mesne conveyance here—describe him as "Of Charles Town, merchant," yet Mr Huhner, with an assurance that is amazing, boldly tells his readers that "he probably had some property there, but that was all." Nor is he any more successful in his attempt to show that Mordecai Sheftall was Commissary General for South Carolina and Georgia. His own authorities refute his contention.

Most remarkable, finally, is Mr Huhner's defence of Lushington's company of Jews, and this in the face of the evidence that was adduced against it. We have, he says, the positive statement of Col Worthington in 1824, a letter to Jared Sparks, and even a statement in Fishell's "Chronological notes" prepared in 1850. We are not warranted in disregarding such "positive proof!" I do not think it necessary to add anything to what I have already written on this subject. There is no doubt about it, Mr Huhner is a genius. I regret that my style of criticism does not appeal to him. I confess that I don't like it myself, but I like Mr Huhner's methods still less, in dealing with which one need not be too particular as to the choice of ways and means. But I must return to my subject.

In my monograph on Joseph Salvador I thought that I had exhausted the references to him in the records of South Carolina. There is one document, however, that I had not found by reason of the fact that it was not recorded here till 1804. For the sake of completeness I will mention it here. It shows that Joseph Salvador was still poorer than I imagined him when he came to South Carolina. The deed is recorded in the office of mesne conveyance on September 19, 1804. (N 7, p 149.) It is dated March 2, 1775, between Joseph Salvador on the first part, and Phineas Serra, Moses Isaac Levey (Levy,) Emanuel Baruk Louvado (Louisada,) Nathan Modigliani, Solomon D'Anynilar (D'Aguilar,) Samuel Haine, Joseph Franco, David Franco, Jacob Consalo, (Consales,) Rebecca Mendès Decosta, Benjamin D'Anynilar, (D'Aguilar,) Jacob Franco, Francis Franco—all of London—who had advanced and lent to him the sum of

£3,000 in certain proportions. He makes over to them 53,000 acres of land excepting such tracts as had been already sold by Rapley, his attorney, and the tract secured to Rebecca Mendes Da Costa.

My story to-day will cover the period from the end of the Revolution to the year 1800. There is nothing very remarkable that happened in this period, nor were there any Jews here of special prominence. Most of those who had left during the period of British occupation returned in 1783, or shortly after. The Jews had suffered in common with their neighbors, and many of them, comparatively wealthy before the Revolution, had to begin the battle of life all over again. Many of them engaged in the "Vendue," or auctioneer and brokerage business. They seem to have possessed the confidence of the community and to have soon regained their former flourishing condition, a circumstance that roused the envy of their less successful competitors, for we find more than one spiteful reference to them in the Gazettes of this period—a sure sign of hard times. (See e. g. Gazette of the State of South Carolina for September 8, 1785.)

Commercially, South Carolina recovered rapidly from the effects of the Revolution, and in the years succeeding that epoch-making event there was a great influx of Jewish population. Jews came here from everywhere—from England, Germany, France, Russia, Poland, Curacoa, Jamaica, St Eustatius, St Domingo, Newport, New York and Philadelphia. I hope in the near future to publish in full the complete list of inscriptions on the tombstones in our old cemetery, which give us a vast amount of information concerning the origin of many of our early settlers. In

1900 or shortly thereafter Charleston had the largest Jewish population in America.

Communally, too, we notice a great development during the period under consideration. From 1750 to 1757 the small congregation worshipped in a small wooden building in Union street, near Queen street. From 1757 to 1764 they were at 318 King street, near Hasell street, in a house "standing back in the yard." In 1764 they purchased the old burial ground at Coming street from Isaac Da Costa. (M. C., Volume 3, p 108.) I shall tell the story of this old ground, which is still in use, elsewhere. In the same year the Synagogue was removed to a building in Beresford street, near King, where they remained till 1781, when they rented a lot and brick building in Hasell street from Joseph Tobias. This building had been occupied as a cotton gin factory, and was now altered and arranged as a place of worship. It was known as the "Old Synagogue." This property, with an adjoining lot, was afterwards purchased from the estate of Joseph Tobias in 1792. (M. C., Volume M 6, pp 45 and 48.) This was not the site, however, on which the present Synagogue stands. The site of the "New Synagogue" was bought from Susannah Quince in 1791. (H. 6., p 98.)

In 1791, we are informed, the Congregation had increased to 52 families, numbering upwards of 400 persons. In this year it became incorporated by an Act of the Legislature. (Statutes of South Carolina, Volume 8, pp. 161-3.) The petition for incorporation is preserved in the "Occident," Volume 1, pp. 384-5. I believe that the original is still in Columbia, though I was not able to put my hands on it during my recent visit there. It is entitled "The petition of the wardens and elders of the Jewish Congregation in Charleston,

called Beth Elohim or House of God." This brings me to a very interesting question: Was "Beth Elohim the name of the old Congregation, or was it only called Beth Elohim for short? As far as I know the question has never been raised.

I was particularly struck by two bequests in the will of Joseph Salvador, (which I printed in full abstract, with the exception of a single item, which I designedly omitted,) and which are as follows:

£100 sterling to Joseph Da Costa, in trust, to pay the same to the Portuguese Congregation in the City of Charleston, known by the name Beth Elohim Unveh Shallom, or the House of the Lord, and Mansion of Peace," and to Mr Gershon Cohen £20 sterling for the German Jewish Congregation in the City of Charleston, known by the name of Beth Elohim, or House of the Lord."

To doubt the evidence of such a record one must have the most positive of proof, yet this record is not without its difficulties. Unfortunately the old "Return Books" are no longer in existence. These would have helped us materially in our inquiry.

First, as to the name "Beth Elohim Unveh Shallom," the late Nathaniel Levin, who wrote his sketch of this Congregation in 1843, and who undoubtedly had seen our oldest book of records, does not refer to it except by its present name, Beth Elohim, nor does any other writer, but that is not strange, seeing that practically nothing new was written until I published my article in the Jewish Comment, and which was largely "incorporated" with remarkable variations in the article in the Jewish Encyclopaedia. In 1784 David Cohen leaves five guineas to K. K. Beth Elohim. (Wills A, p 359.) In 1787 Joseph Myers

leaves three-fourths of his estate to K. K. Beth Elohim. (Wills B, p 128.)

It looked very much as though there was some mistake in Salvador's will. In historical matters, however, it does not pay to jump at conclusions. I waited patiently and was rewarded a few days ago by stumbling across another will, which settled the question. In the same volume. (Wills A, p 597.) Moses Molina leaves £15 sterling to the "Portuguese Jew Congregation of Beth Elohim Unve Shalom." There might be a mistake in one will, but hardly in two. We may, therefore, take it as proven, that the original name of the Charleston Congregation was not "Beth Elohim," but "Beth Elohim Unveh Shalom," and that it was called "Beth Elohim" for brevity.

But we are not yet out of difficulty. Do we know anything of a German-Jewish Congregation in Charleston in 1786, known by the name of "Beth Elohim?" Apart from this reference in the will of Joseph Salvador, I know no place where such a German-Jewish Congregation is mentioned. Though there are many bequests in the wills to Beth Elohim, there is not a single one to a German-Jewish Congregation. This is remarkable in view of the fact that with few exceptions these bequests were made by those who were not Portuguese Jews by birth. None of the contemporary writers who have referred to the Charleston Jewish community, so far as I have till now been able to ascertain, know of more than one Congregation and place of worship. Besides this there is the fact that in the eighteenth century the custom was not usual among German Jews of giving names to congregations or synagogues. And if they gave such a name to a congregation in Charleston, would they have given the same name as that which the Portuguese Congrega-

tion bore? And, finally, there is no reason for the existence of such a congregation here in 1786. All writers have taken particular pains to emphasize the fact of the prejudice or antagonism that existed between the German and Portuguese Jews. There is no trace of such prejudice or antagonism in the history of the Jews of South Carolina prior to 1800. German and Portuguese Jews intermarried freely, and the only lines of demarkation between them were the natural distinctions of birth and education. As a matter of fact, except at the very beginning of the communal history of Beth Elohim, German Jews have always formed a decided majority. When the eight corner-stones of the "New Synagogue" were laid in 1792, of the eight men who laid laid them: Israel Joseph, Philip Hart, Lyon Moses, Isaac Moses, Emanuel Abrahams, Mark Tongues, Hart Moses and Abraham Moses Sr, seven, I believe, were German Jews, and of the committee of arrangements on this occasion—Daniel Hart, Gershon Cohen and Moses C. Levy, two at least, if not all three, were German Jews. I do not care to be dogmatic, especially in the face of record evidence, but I would certainly like some additional proof of the existence of a German-Jewish Congregation here in 1786. Till further proof is adduced I shall continue to doubt. But I must get back to my main theme.

In 1792, the Synagogue being too small, the Congregation determined to erect a larger place of worship. The members contributed liberally and the requisite $20,000 was soon raised. I shall not go into details here. These details are fully given, both in the Occident (Volume 1, pp 306-8,) and also in the Year Book for 1883. (Pp 306-8.) The corner-stones were laid on Fri-

day, September 14, 1792, with elaborate ceremonial, conducted "by the rules and regulations of the ancient and honorable fraternity of Free Masons."

The Synagogue was completed in 1794 and was consecrated on Friday, the 19th of September, of that year. At this consecration there were present Governor Moultrie, the civil and military officers of the State, the municipal authorities, the clergy and many citizens. There is a notice of the ceremonies in the South Carolina State Gazette of September 20, 1794.

But I must again go back a little. On the establishment of the Federal Government in 1790 the Jewish community of Charleston addressed a letter of congratulation to Washington on his elevation to the Presidency. They also joined the Jewish Congregations of Philadelphia, New York and Richmond in a similar letter. I will not reprint these letters, which can be referred to in the Year Book for 1883, Pp 302-5. Washington's reply to the individual letter is printed in the Year Book for 1884, pp 280-1 and to the joint letter, in Wolf's "The American Jew as Citizen and Patriot," pp 58-9. The original reply to the Charleston Congregation was probably burnt in the great fire of 1838.

The character of the Jewish community in 1790 may be judged by the following incident, which has been preserved to us in the Occident. (Volume 1, pp 339-40.) In that year a Constitutional Convention was held in Columbia and in the election of delegates to that Convention the Jews took an active part. Grateful for the assistance which the Jews had rendered him, one of the elected delegates sent the following communication to the vestry:

To the Vestry of the Jewish Congregation:

Gentlemen: I feel myself greatly obliged

by the assistance I received from you and the members of your Congregation at the late election. If the enclosed can serve the poor, or be of any use in any respect to the Congregation, I request their acceptance of it, to be applied in any such manner as they shall think proper. I shall be glad of any future opportunity of rendering any service to the Congregation. Your obliged and humble servant.

CHRISTOPHER KNIGHT.

The following reply, re-enclosing the order for 50 guineas, was sent to Mr Knight:

Mr C. Knight—

Sir: Your favor of the 28th ultimo, with the enclosed acceptance for fifty guineas, has been laid before our body, for which token of esteem we are extremely obliged to you, but when we consider the motive that has induced you to offer it, consistent with the tenor of your letter, we cannot on any consideration think of accepting it, as it may be suggested at some future period that the members of our community were to be bought. We have, therefore, thought necessary to return it, assuring you, we shall entertain a deep sensibility of your good intentions. We remain your obedient servants,

Jacob Cohen.

President of the Congregation K. K. B E.

During the period we are now discussing the Jews of South Carolina do not appear to have taken any very prominent part in public life. There are only a few references to Jews who occupied public offices. Solomon Cohen was postmaster for Georgetown in 1794, and Abraham Cohen filled the same position in 1797. Eleazer Elizer was postmaster in Greenville in 1794 and Abraham Selxas was keeper of the Work House in Charleston in 1797, and for several years subsequently. Nor do we find many Jews in the professions at this period. In 1795 I find men-

tion of a Dr Sarzedas. I am not certain whether he was a physician, but I know that he kept a drug store. After 1800, however, the Jews of Charleston played a conspicuous part in Art, in Science and in Literature, to all of which they made eminent contributions. What they did in these spheres I shall relate elsewhere. They attained considerable prominence, commercially, however, principally, as I have already stated, in the "Vendue" business. One of these "Vendue masters" has left us an advertisement which gives us a good insight into the miscellaneous nature of a brokerage business of those days. It is to be found in the South Carolina State Gazette for September 6, 1784. I reproduce it for its unique character. I have not met with anything like it in the Gazettes:

ADVERTISEMENT.

ABRAHAM SEIXAS,
All so gracious,
Once again does offer
His service pure
For to secure
Money in the coffer.

He has for sale
Some negroes, male,
Will suit full well grooms,
He has likewise
Some of their wives
Can make clean, dirty rooms.

For planting, too,
He has a few
To sell, all for the cash,
Of various price,
To work the rice
Or bring them to the lash.

The young ones true,
If that will do,
May some be had of him
To learn your trade
They may be made,
Or bring them to your trim.

The boatmen great,
Will you elate
They are so brisk and free;
What e'er you say,
They will obey,
If you buy them of me.

He also can
Suit any man
With land all o'er the State;
A bargain, sure,
They may procure
If they dont stay too late.

For papers he
Will sure agree,
Bond, note or publick debt;
To sell the same
If with good name
And buyer can be met.

To such of those
As will dispose
He begs of them to tell;
By note or phiz,
What e'er it is
That they have got to sell.

He surely will
Try all his skill
To sell, for more or less,
The articles
Of beaux and belles,
That they to him address.

The following is a fairly complete directory of the Jews of Charleston from 1783 to 1800. I omit all names that we have met heretofore. It must be supplemented, however, by my list of members of K. K. Beth Elohim for 1800, which I have already printed.

Aaron, Solomon, Jr.
Aarons, Jacob.
Abendanone, Joseph.
Abrahams, Abraham.
Abrahams, Isaac.
Abrahams, Jacob.
Abrams, Moise.
Alexander, Abraham, Jr.
Azuby, Rev Abraham.
Barret, Solomon.

Benedix, Isaac.
Benzakin, Joseph.
Bush, David
Canter, David.
Canter, Emanuel.
Canter, Joshua.
Cantor, Jacob.
Cantor, Jacob, Jr.
Cohen, Jacob A.
Cohen, Levi.
Cohen, Mordicai.
Cohen, Solomon.
Cohen, Solomon I.
Da Costa, Aaron.
De La Motta, Isaac (or Motta.)
De Leon, Jacob.
De Lieben, Israel.
Depass, Ralph.
Derkheim, Myer.
Elizer, Eleazer.
Gomes, Elias.
Harby, Isaac.
Harby, Solomon.
Harris, Andrew.
Harris, Hyam.
Hart, Abraham Levy.
Hart, Alexander Moses.
Hart, Bernard.
Hart, Daniel.
Hart, Ephraim.
Hart, Hart Moses.
Hart, Naphtali.
Hart, Nathan.
Hart, Simon.
Hart, Simon M.
Hyams, Samuel.
Hyams, Solomon.
Isaacks, Moses.
Isaacs, Abraham.
Jacobs, Abraham.
Jacobs, Samuel.
Jonas, Joshua.
Joseph, Solomon Moses.
Lazarus, Aaron.
Levi, Abraham.

Levi, Solomon.
Levy, Hyam.
Levy, Hyam E.
Levy, Lyon.
Levy, Mordecai.
Levy, Moses.
Levy, Moses C.
Levy, Reuben.
Levy, Solomon, Jr.
Lopez, Aaron. (From Newport.)
Lopez, David.
Marks, Humphry.
Milhado, Benjamin. (From Jamaica.)
Moise, Abraham. (From Cape Francois.)
Moise, Cherry.
Moise, Hyam. (From Port au Prince.)
Moses, Isaac.
Moses, Lyon.
Moses, Philip. (From St Eustatius.)
Myers, Abraham.
Myers, Israel.
Moses, Joseph, Jr.
Nathan, Abraham.
Nathan, Solomon.
Nathans, David.
Noah, Manuel.
Pimentel, Aaron.
Philips, Benjamin.
Philips, David. (From Jamaica.)
Polock, Solomon. (From Newport.)
Sarzedas, Moses.
Seixas, Abraham Mendes.
Simons, Montague.
Solomons, Francis.
Suares, David. (From Curacoa.)
Tobias, Isaac.
Woolf or Wolfe, Solomon.

With this I bring my story to an end. I hope that I may be deemed to have made a not unimportant contribution to the history of this State and to the story of the Jews in America.

HUHNER VS ELZAS.

THE NEW YORKER OBJECTS TO DR ELZAS'S CRITICISMS.

Some Correspondence that Does not Affect the Questions at Issue—Faulty Encyclopaedias Cited in Defence of an Error—Stands by his Story of Salvador—Is not Familiar with Tory Records of this State—Thinks Lushington's Company was Composed of Jews—Continental Officers from Other States Credited to South Carolina—Thinks the Act of 1811 Created First Free School Commissioners in Charleston.

[Reprinted from The News and Courier.]

To the Editor of The Sunday News: There recently appeared in your columns, (December 14, 1902,) a review of my article on Charleston in the Jewish Encyclopedia. The reverend gentleman who wrote that review is a stranger to me, one whom I have never met nor corresponded with, though I became aware of his existence some eight months ago, when I learned that, without my knowledge, he had obtained some unpublished manuscripts of mine relating to the early history of the Jews in South Carolina from a person who neither had my authority or consent to make any such use of my work.

The review is so grossly unfair and unjust as to make it absolutely unworthy of consideration and I had determined to ignore it altogether, but for the fact that the reverend gentleman has seen fit to have his attack reprinted, sending it broadcast not only to the press, but to private individuals as well.

(Here follows correspondence irrelevant to the points at issue.)

* * * * * * * *

At the outset the review attempts to create an impression that my own work is unduly emphasized in the bibliography given in the Encyclopedia. A glance at the article will prove the absolute injustice of this. The bibliography mentions most of the works from which my material was drawn and near the end of the list I am justified in including my own essay, simply because it collects practically all the authorities on the subject which I

have been able to find in New York libraries. This was done simply because such a collection may prove both useful and time-saving to others desiring to make further research.

Practically every criticism mentioned in the review is of a frivolous character. Thus, as to the position of Charleston, the reviewer says: "Mr Huhner cannot even tell that straight," for he calls it the capital of the county of the same name. The use of the word "capital" in that connection has been sanctioned by the very best authorities, and had the reverend gentleman but taken the trouble to look at the Encyclopaedia Brittanica or Chambers's Encyclopaedia he would have found Charleston designated in the same way as the Capital of Charleston County. Lest, however, he might argue that these are English publications, I would call attention to the American Encyclopaedia, Volume 4, published by D. Appleton & Co. and edited by no less distinguished writers than George Ripley and Charles A. Dana, where he will find that the article on Charleston begins by calling it "the Capital of Charleston County." The same is true of Johnson's Universal Encyclopaedia, edited by that well known scholar, Charles K. Adams. In fact there is hardly an encyclopaedia of importance that does not call Charleston the capital of Charleston County.

My failure to name Levy Sheftall as one of the early members of the Charleston congregation is commented upon, but the reverend gentleman well knows that my essay itself contains several other names besides which are not mentioned in the Encyclopedia article, simply because such an article must of necessity be condensed. He must also have known that I did not refer to Lindo as a military man and my article on Lindo, already in the hands of the editors of the Encyclopedia, will show that I had quite a little material on that Pre-Revolutionary worthy.

I need not spend any time on his comments concerning Francis Salvador. My paper on that patriot, published long since and giving the authorities for the statements therein contained, is a sufficient answer. I pass over also the quibbling claim that there was no such body as a Colonial Assembly in South Carolina, but a "Commons House of Assembly." Wh

does surprise me, however, is his inference that Salvador never was a member of the Assembly at all. My published paper gives the authority for the statement, and I might also call attention to that magnificent work on American history published under the auspices of Congress, edited by no less an authority than Peter Force, namely, the American Archives. In Volume 4, 5th series, of that work, page 620, there appears the title "South Carolina General Assembly." The references there to Salvador will convince anyone that he was a member of that body. There are other references in that volume as well, particularly at page 626 and at 637. The latter reference mentions that the General Assembly had received word to appoint a committee to meet the committee of the Legislative council and the House had once appointed Col Pinckney, the Hon Mr Drayton and Mr Salvador for that purpose. In fact, by the Constitution of 1776, the members of the Provincial Congress, of which Salvador was a member, were also members of the General Assembly.

Both Drayton, in his memoirs, Volume 1, page 348, and Chapman, in his History of Edgefield County, page 170, refer to Salvador as a member of the General Assembly. As, however, my published essay on Salvador sufficiently covers the subject, it is needless to go into further detail.

The criticism that Salvador's remains are not buried in Charleston comes with ill grace indeed from the learned reviewer, who for years has been rabbi in Charleston, and presumably ought to know the fact, because of the ease with which he can verify the same. Only as recently as May 30, 1902, however, he himself wrote in the Jewish Comment, "Francis Salvador was killed in 1776. His remains rest in the old De Costa burial ground in Charleston, where his tombstone can still be seen."

I will frankly state that I was unable to find any reference to Jewish Tories in South Carolina during the American Revolution. The reviewer refers to a petition to Sir Henry Clinton, signed by 166 citizens of Charleston and containing seven Jewish names. I confess I have been unable to find a copy of this petition in our public libraries in New York and if such a petition has been discovered I am confident that that discovery has been made as

recently as within a year or two. Some three years ago I examined every book on the history of Sout Carolina in the Lenox, the Astor and Columbia libraries, of this city, and was unable to find mention of Jewish Tories.

I have long been familiar with the petition of the citizens of Charleston to Gen Lincoln to surrender the town, because they felt that further resistance would be useless. That petition was signed by many Jews, it is true, and has long since been incorporated in my essay on South Carolina. The Jews who signed it, however, were patriots, not Tories, and this is evidently not the petition that the reviewer refers to.

In looking over my notes, also, I find that three years ago I examined that valuable and scarce work on the siege of Charleston written by W. B. Hough and published by Munsell, at Albany. That is certainly the standard work on the subject. While Hough does give an address of Loyalists in 1780 signed by over 200 persons, it is equally true that not a single Jewish name appears among the signatures.

Even if another petition has been discovered (and it must have been brought to light very recently) it would by no means follow that even those names were names of Tories; for we gave a similar address in New York history and some of the names in that connection were proven to be names of patriots who were compelled to sign, by threats of violence or similar means. Assuming, however, that that was not the case in South Carolina, I will frankly say that I am glad that sufficient interest has been aroused in the South to bring to light new documents, and will repeat that much more unpublished material must be in existence and will be discoverd when South Carolina follows the wise policy of other States in collecting and publishing her public records.

When, however, the reverend gentleman goes further in his review, refers to that petition as "the well known petition" and says that "the veriest tyro who knows anything at all of the history of South Carolina cannot be guilty," etc, and that "there is no excuse for such ignorance," his statement is, to say the least, grossly misleading, for he well knows that no such

reference has appeared in any published work, unless recently. And when he further says that Gen McCrady has enough on the subject for anyone who desires information, he must be aware that the General makes no mention of Jewish Tories in his great work, a work much of which I had read and read with the interest it deserves, and of which South Carolina may justly be proud. It is most unfair, therefore, to call a recently discovered petition (if such is the fact) a copy of which cannot even be found in the Lenox Library of this city, a well known document.

The learned reviewer next challenges my statement as to the corps of volunteer infantry organized in 1779 and composed almost exclusively of Israelites. In this connection he says: "This special corps of King street Jewish merchants is, I am satisfied, one of the myths of history."

Lest anyone be misled by such remarks, and in the interest of the Jewish community of Charleston, I will give my authority for the statement I have made. To my mind that company was a reality and by no means a myth.

During the struggle for Jewish emancipation in Maryland, which commenced in 1818 and lasted for six or seven years, bitterly opposed by one element, while strongly encouraged by the other many addresses were delivered by prominent men and many pamphlets were circulated on the subject, some of which have come down to us.

When the struggle was at its height in 1824 an address was made in favor of the "Jews bill" before the House of Delegates by Col J. W. Worthington, who in view of the bitter opposition must have been careful indeed about the facts he cited in favor of his contention. In that address occurs the following statement: "Here is another paper which contains the names of the corps of volunteer infantry in Charleston, South Carolina, in February, 1779. It was composed chiefly of Israelites residing on King street and was commanded by Capt Lushington and afterward fought under Gen Moultrie at the battle of Beaufort."

If further evidence is required I would refer the reviewer to a paper prepared for Volume 2 for the American Jewish Historical Society publication by Prof Herbert

B. Adams and Prof I. H. Hollander, where references are made to a letter written many years ago by Jacob I. Cohen to the famous Jared Sparks, of Harvard University. From the letter I quote the following: "I mentioned to you a military company that was formed in Charleston, South Carolina, composed almost exclusively of Israelites, of which my uncle was a member," etc. A similar statement is made, I believe, in the address of Dr De La Motta, delivered at the consecration of the Savannah synagogue in 1820. I would also refer to the paper in Leeser's Occident, Volume 13, page 143, and Mr Kohler's "Incidents of American Jewish Patriotism," Volume 4, American Jewish Historical Society publications, page 96.

It is unnecessary to answer the criticism that I refer to so few of the Southern Jews who served in the field, for that would be impossible in an article limited to 1,000 words.

The next criticism refers to Mordecai Sheftall, whom I refer to as commissary general for South Carolina and Georgia. The reverend reviewer implies not only that this was not the fact, but says further: "It is strange that Mr Heitman does not put him down as a Continental officer if he occupied such a postion." I cannot understand the motive for making such a misstatement. It requires but a glance at Heitman's Historical Register, published in 1893, at page 63, to find Mordecai Sheftall mentioned as a Continental officer. As to his appointment as deputy commissary of issues in South Carolina and Georgia, see Journal of Congress, October 28, 1778, and Dr Friedenwald's paper in three American Jewish Historical Society publications, page 86. In his petition, also, Sheftall refers to himself as deputy commissary of issues for the Southern department during the Revolutionary war." See Kohler's article, above referred to, where additional authorities are given. (See, also, my paper on Mordecai Sheftall in Jewish Comment for November, 1890.)

The reviewer takes offence at my mention of Major Nones in connection with an article on Charleston. Major Nones was a French Jew, and I will give his own words as to his Revolutionary career: "I fought throughout the whole of the Revolutionary war in the militia of Charleston and in Polafsky's Legion. I fought in almost

every action which took place in Carolina." (See Dr Adler's paper in 1 A. J. H. S., page 112.) It was certainly no more than right to include Major Nones in an article on Charleston, even though he subsequently resided in Philadelphia.

The statement made in my article that Myer Moses was one of the first commissioners of education in Charleston is denied in the review, with the following comment: "Myer Moses was one of the commissioners of free schools—a purely local office, which had been in existence for upwards of one hundred years before Myer Moses was elected to it."

Let us see. In an elaborate article on "Education in Charleston," written for the Charleston Year Book for 1886 by Mr Henry P. Archer, superintendent of city public schools, the following statement is made at page 174: "The free schools thus far established were by special Acts of the Assembly and for special purposes, but on the 2d of December, 1811, the Legislature passed an Act establishing free schools throughout the State, and this was really the beginning of the public school system, as such, in South Carolina."

"One of the provisions for carrying the Act of 1811 into effect was that the Legislature every three years appoint not less than three nor more than thirteen commissioners of each election district. The number appointed by the Legislature which passed this Act was as follows: Thirteen for St Philip's and St Mary's (City of Charleston.) The thirteen commissioners were—Myer Moses, etc.etc."

That certainly disposes of the criticism on my statement.

I feel I have already taken up too much of your valuable space.

What I have said was said simply to correct erroneous impressions that may have been created by that unfair review.

With the reviewer's grudge toward the editors of the Encyclopedia I have nothing to do any more than with his abusive language. He is a stranger to me and I certainly have no feeling in the matter. I believe, however, that I may honestly say that the Charleston community may read my sketch in the Encyclopedia with just pride and satisfacuon.

Trusting that you will insert the foregoing as a simple act of justice I am

Leon Huhner.

New York, February 3.

EVIDENCE IN REBUTTAL.

Dr Elzas Substantiates his First Criticisms.

Inasmuch as the original review of Mr Huhner's article, "Charleston," in the Jewish Encyclopedia, was written by Dr Elzas at the request of The News and Courier, the foregoing reply of Mr Huhner has been referred to Dr Elzas, who makes the following rejoinder:

So Mr Huhner has replied. I would have allowed Mr Huhner to have the floor and not bothered with him any further, but his letter contains so much of a personal nature that might mislead, and so much plausible error, that I am compelled again, though most unwillingly, to devote attention to him and show that my criticism was neither unjust nor unfair, but most just and eminently proper.

First, then, let me dispose of the mysterious correspondence of Mr Huhner with the "Southern gentleman." The story can be told in a very few words. Some time in 1900 or 1901, having to lay over for a few hours in Columbia, I dropped into the office of the "Southern gentleman" to say good-bye. On his desk, open, lay Mr Huhner's article, which to the best of my belief had already been published. I knew nothing of how it got there. A brief glance showed me what the article was, but I was particularly attracted by Mr Moses Lindo's Revolutionary title. I drew my friend's attention to it and he asked me whether it was the only mistake I saw. I will state here that the abstract in the American Hebrew to which I shall refer is a good condensation of the paper, the only addition that I can remember being a long excerpt from the Charleston Year Book for 1883 and a list of Revolutionary patriots, "possibly Jewish." Having a five hours' ride on the train I asked my friend whether I might read it through and return it to him. He assented and I took it. It took me just fifteen minutes to read it. I found that there was absolutely nothing in it. I put it in my satchel and it was never again opened by me. The article was promptly returned to Columbia. What I thought of it may be gathered from an extract of a letter of

mine to Funk & Wagnalls dated July 17, 1901: "It occurred to me at the time that the 'research' therein contained together with the article itself might have occupied its author a half dozen hours, and he have time to spare." But that is neither here nor there. Why I demanded the return of my contracts with Funk & Wagnalls and later refused to surrender my article is of no interest to the general reader, nor has it any bearing upon the subject of my review.

Mr Huhner is of opinon that practically every criticism I made is fricolous. I will again try to convince him to the contrary. With all his authorities and with all his preparation, he has been unable to answer one of them. I will leave the question of whether Charleston is the Capital of Charleston County and come at once to Moses Lindo.

"He must also have known," says Mr Huhner, "that I did not refer to Lindo as a military man." To the best of my recollection—for I did not make a single note of the article—Mr Huhner referred to Lindo as a rich Charleston farmer, who during the Revolution became Inspector General for South Carolina. But I must not trust to memory. Let me quote the abstract of Mr Huhner's paper, which appeared three days after its delivery in the "American Hebrew" of December 29, 1899. It will be found on p. 267 and affords ample testimony as to the standing of Mr Huhner as a historian. As no correction was made in any succeeding issue, we are justified in taking the report as correct. Here is the opening paragraph, faithfully copied:

"Leon Huhner, Esq. read his paper, entitled "The Jews of South Carolina Prior to 1800." The settlement of Charleston took place in 1686, and nine years later a document makes some mention of a Jew. It is a remarkable fact, worthy of commendation, that during the Revolutionary War not one Jew with Tory tendencies was found. AMONG THOSE WHO WERE IN THE ARMY WAS MOSES LINDO, who held an important post, and Francis Labrador, perhaps the most distinguished of all. One of the corps of volunteers organized for the defence of Charleston, in the latter part of the war, was composed chiefly of Israelites, and of this corps favorable mention is made in the war annals, though unfortunately the names of

those composing it are lost. A remarkable fact is that most of the Jewish soldiers were officers of some rank."

The capitals are mine. Labrador is a mistake evidently for Salvador, but Labrador is just as correct as the rest of the statements, all of which are incorporated in the article in the Encyclopaedia. The date 1686 is not a mistake, for the second reference is to Archdale in 1695. The New York libraries must possess remarkable books to have yielded such original results even to an explorer of Mr Huhner's ability. So much, however, for Mr Huhner's honesty.

And now for Mr Salvador. In Mr Huhner's article, referring to this patriot, we were informed that Salvador resided near Charleston, that he was a member of the Colonial Assembly as early as 1774, and that his remains were interred in the old Charleston cemetery. In my review I pointed out that Mr Huhner made no less than four mistakes in these three statements. Those four mistakes are still there If Mr Huhner had been familiar with the history of South Carolina he would have been able to understand what he read in Force's "Archives." I repeat what I said in my review that Salvador was never a member of the Commons House of Assembly of the Province of South Carolina, or, as Mr Huhner calls it, the "Colonial Assembly." He was a member of the second Provincial Congress which declared South Carolina AN INDEPENDENT STATE, and which resolved itself into a General Assembly. It is apparent, therefore, that it is incorrect to term that a "Colonial Assembly." It was a State Legislature, and was not even elected as such. I can make the case no stronger than by quoting Mr Salley's review of Mr Huhner's "Salvador" in the South Carolina Historical Magazine for January, 1902. Referring to Mr Huhner's statement that Salvador was "elected a member of the General Assembly of South Carolina," Mr Salley says:

"That is not true. No election for members of the Commons House of Assembly (not General Assembly, for there was none) ever took place in South Carolina while Salvador was a resident of the Province. The last election held prior to the independent government established March 26, 1776, was held the latter part of 1772--before Salvador came to South Car-

olina—and the first election for the General Assembly created by the Constitution of 1776 took place in October, 1776—after Salvador's death. Salvador was, however, a deputy to both of the Provincial Congresses held in South Carolina prior to the Constitution of 1776."

This is surely clear enough to one who knows the history of South Carolina. It is not quibbling. Mr Huhner has authorities enough, but does not know enough of the subject to understand what he reads.

But Mr Huhner makes a big hit. My article in the "Jewish Comment" for May 30, 1902, is his authority for the statement that Salvador is buried here. His article in the Encyclopaedia shows quite a creditable acquaintance with mine in the Jewish Comment, only it is well embellished, and it is the adornments that have got Mr Huhner into trouble. He appropriated my silver and forgot to rub off the hallmark. The mistake I made was due to the fact that my article was written at a few hours' notice and was corrected in the following number and does not occur in the reprint in the "Israelite" or in The News and Courier. The mistake was an unfortunate one for Mr Huhner.

Mr Huhner next tells us that he was unable to find my reference to Jewish Tories in South Carolina during the American Revolution. He can't find the "Petition to Sir Henry Clinton" with the names of Jews, in the libraries in New York, and if such a petition has been discovered it has been discovered as recently as within a year or two! Some three years ago he examined every book in the Lenox, Astor and Columbia libraries and was unable to find mention of Jewish Tories. Even Munsell's "Siege of Charleston," "which is certainly the standard work on the subject," didn't enlighten him.

Poor Mr Huhner! Who on earth but Mr Huhner would ever dream of writing the history of the Jews of Charleston in New York? If he is writing the early story, has he in New York the 36 volumes of Records relating to South Carolina from the State paper office in London, the Jewish references in which I recently published? Has he in New York the Probate Records, or the Records of Mesne Conveyance? Has he in New York the primary sources of all history, the Gazettes? Yet what history can possibly be written without these? The best that can be done is

only second-hand scissors-and-pencil writing, and Mr Huhner cannot even do that intelligently. Just imagine a man who pretends to be a historian declaring that "it is most unfair to call a recently discovered petition (if such is a fact) a copy of which cannot even be found in the Lenox Library of this city, a well known document!" Mr Huhner is to be pitied rather than blamed.

But the New York libraries are not as bad as Mr Huhner makes them out. The fault is not with the libraries. Does the Lenox Library not possess Sabine's "American Loyalists?" If Mr Huhner had consulted even that supremely wretched work he would have found the name of Isaac De Lyon. All honor to that man who showed a fearless devotion to principle amid the opposing current of popular opinion and whose conduct was guided by his best judgment for his country's good. He was in excellent company. He is to be respected far more than those who sat on the fence, and there were many such.

If Mr Huhner knew anything of South Carolina history, he would have known that the estates of the Tories were confiscated after the Revolution and he could have found the list in Vol VI of the "Statutes of South Carolina," p. 633. Here he likewise would have found the name of Isaac De Lyon. Is there not a copy of this in New York? There would doubtless have been other amercements, but the others were poor or had been impoverished by the war and they had nothing to amerce.

And who but Mr Huhner would think of describing Munsell's "Siege of Charleston" as "Certainly the standard work on the subject?" One might almost doubt whether he has seen the inside of it. This is one of the rare books printed in Albany in 1867, in a limited edition of 100 copies, and largely made up of abstracts from contemporary NEW YORK papers—Rivington's Gazette—and New York was a long way from the scene.

And now a word as to the petition to Clinton. McCrady mentions it and has a powerful word to say in defence of those who signed it, and who afterwards took the field. There is no record of Jews being amongst these, and I prefer to take the records in preference to Mr Huhner. The document speaks for itself. Here are 166 citizens of Charles Town, including 7

well known Jews, affirming that they are "most sincerely affected to his Majesty's person and Government" and petitioning to be allowed "to evince the sincerity of their professions." This petition was referred to "gentlemen of known loyalty and integrity, as well as knowledge of the persons and characters of the inhabitants, in order to report the manner in which the memorialists had heretofore conducted themselves," and they report favorably on the cases of the 166 citizens, including 7 Jews whose names are known to us. It is surely not my fault that the Lenox Library has not a copy of this document. I can tell Mr Huhner a great many other things relating to South Carolina that they do not possess in New York. But that petition was published in the Charleston papers at the time of its presentation and has been here in the Charleston Library ever since. It has been examined by hundreds of people as the well-worn page attests. Does anyone still doubt the fact that the man who writes on South Carolina history cannot do the subject or any feature of the subject justice, unless he exploits the records of South Carolina in South Carolina? Let others learn this much-needed lesson.

I must now again refer for Mr Huhner's benefit to the traditional "corps of volunteer infantry" and give him some additional information. I repeat what I said in my review, this corps is a myth. Mr Huhner produces remarkable authority. Let us see what it amounts to. He refers especially to an article in Leeser's "Occident" for 1858 and to Mr Kohler's article in Vol 4 of the Am. J. H. S. The latter is identical with the former and is nothing but a clipping from the Occident. Here it is, almost in its entirety:

SOUTH CAROLINA JEWISH PATRIOTS

The following item from an article by Rev Isaac Leeser, in the Occident, Vol XVI, p. 142 (1858) gives in some little detail a story since then oft repeated; the primary authorities for the incident are still unknown to the writer thereof: "A company of soldiers who did good service in the defence of Charleston harbor were nearly all, if not all, Jews. The names of Daniel W. Cardozo, Jacob I. Cohen, Sr, and Isaiah Isaacs, we think, must have been on the roll of that company. * * * Sheftall Sheftall, Isaac N. Cardozo, a

brother of David, and Col Bush, occur to us just now as brave soldiers in the Revolution, and no doubt many others are known to other persons." Compare with this the following passage from a speech of Col J. W. D. Worthington on the Jew bill, Maryland, 1824, (Speeches on the Jew Bill, etc. by H. N. Brackenridge, Phila. 1829, p. 115:) "Here is another paper which contains the names of a corps of volunteer infantry, in Charleston, South Carolina, in February, 1779. It was composed chiefly of Israelites, residing in King's street and was commanded by Capt Lushington, and afterward fought under Gen Moultrie at the battle of Beaufort."

As for the company of Jews in the defence of Charleston harbor, it is most remarkable that no mention of it is made in contemporary records. It is certainly original for historians to mention names whom they "think must have been on the rolls." Col Bush, a Jew, in South Carolina, is a new name to me.

The second corps is the traditional one organized in 1779. The foregoing clipping shows that I was correct in my review, in surmising that Mr Huhner referred to Capt Richard Lushington's company of the Charles Town regiment of militia. I corrected Mr Huhner's mistake in giving the date of the organization of this regiment as 1779. It had been in existence since 1738. But do we know anything from other sources of Capt Lushington's command? We do. In the Gazette of the State of South Carolina of November 11, 1778, appear the names of 12 members of Lushington's company of whom but 2 are Jews. In the same for March 16, 1779, 5 more names are given of men belonging to this company and only one of these is a Jew. So that, out of 17 names of men who served in this company at the time at which Mr Huhner says it was organized, there are only 3 Jews. Lushington's command was probably in round numbers 50 men. On the petition of militiamen who served at the siege of Charleston, and Lushington's company served in the siege, there are 12 or possibly 13 Jewish names. Suppose they all belonged to Lushington's company, would they constitute the bulk of that company? But why did they need Lushington at all, if Mr Huhner's "remarkable fact" is true that most of the Jewish soldiers were officers of some rank?" Let me dismiss Mr Huhner's mili-

tary history, by stating that I have a practically complete list of all the Jews who lived in Charleston during the Revolution, and that there were not enough Jews living in Charleston—of fighting age—to constitute a company. It is intelligible that an earnest advocate in an excited debate should use every scrap of available fact and tradition, but there is no excuse for this in a man who pretends to write history.

And now a word concerning Mordecai Sheftall. Mr Huhner referred to him as commissary general for South Carolina and Georgia. I objected, a little vaguely perhaps, that it was strange that Mr Heitman did not put him down as a Continental officer—of course it was understood from South Carolina. Sheftall was a "Deputy Commissary-General of Issues for the Southern Department," i. e., to the Continental Army assigned to the Southern Department. But is "Deputy Commissary-General of Issues for the Southern Department" synonymous in Mr Huhner's mind with "Commissary-General for South Carolina and Georgia? Let Mr Huhner look at his history, if there is one in New York, and he will find that the commissary general of South Carolina was a State officer of militia and that his name was Thomas Farr, Junr.

And now just a word about Myer Moses, Jr. Here again Mr Huhner does not understand what he has read. Does this Act state that these were the first "Commissioners of Free Schools?" (not Education.) He refers to the Year Book for 1883, p. 174. Let me call his attention to p. 173. Historians should always read the preceding page. Here we read as follows:

"There can be no doubt that the free school for the inhabitants of South Carolina mentioned in the Act of 1712 was the free school established in Charleston under the Act of 1710 and that the gentlemen mentioned above constitute the first Board of Free School Commisisoners in Charleston and in the State." (Long list given above.) Can Mr Huhner read English? This is surely evidence enough for my criticism that the office of "Commissioner of Free Schools" had been in existence for upwards of a hundred years before Myer Moses, Jr. was elected to it.

In my review of Mr Huhner's article I did not exhaust his mistakes, though I challenged nearly every statement he

made. I could proceed with these mistakes and show further absurdities in his recently published "Jews of Georgia," where he volunteers some extraordinary information about the Jews of Charleston, but, unlike Mr Huhner, I will keep to the record. Mr Huhner knows absolutely nothing about the story of the Jews of Charleston. It is as yet an unwritten history. How should Mr Huhner know it? He has not examined a single original record and he has not seen the records of Beth Elohim. Where is his history coming from? No man has a right to write history for an Encyclopedia, which sets itself up as authoritative, without doing the work properly. I think that I have made good my claim that Mr Huhner's article is an unparelleled monument of ignorance. I am content to leave the matter to the arbitrament of my readers.

In conclusion I will call attention to this significant fact: Mr Huhner's paper before the Am. J. H. S. was read in 1899. In his article he refers to it in his biography as material available to the student. That paper has not yet been published. WHY?

Barnett A. Elzas.

THE DAGGETT PRTG CO. CHASN. S. C

ELZAS VS HUHNER.

A FINAL WORD IN THE JEWISH ENCYCLOPAEDIA CONTROVERSY.

Dr Barnett A. Elzas Establishes the Justice of his Criticisms of Mr Huhner's Article "Charleston" by Reference to Authorities in this State whom None can Gainsay.

[Reprinted from The News and Courier.]

The following communication has been addressed by Dr B. A. Elzas to the "Jewish Comment" and to the "American Hebrew" as a final word in his Jewish Encyclopaedia controversy:

Editor Jewish Comment:

In fairness to myself, I ask your indulgence and space for the following correspondence. I think that it settles conclusively the question of whether Mr Huhner has in any way justified himself in the matter of the article "Charleston" in the Jewish Encyclopaedia.

February 9, 1903.

Mr A S. Salley, Jr, Sec, South Carolina Historical Society—Dear Sir:

I am sending you my copy of Vol III of theJewish Encyclopaedia, containing the article "Charleston," also my review of same, as well as a marked copy of last Sunday's News and Courier. You will observe that my Review has given rise to a very unpleasant controversy. Might I ask you in the interest of historical investigation, and as an acknowledged authority on the history of this State, to prepare a brief resume of the relevant points in the respective papers, and to send same to me at as early a date as is convenient to you. I trust that you will find this matter of sufficient importance to warrant you in acceding to my request.

Respectfully yours, Barnett A. Elzas.

At the same time, I addressed a letter to Gen Edward McCrady, the historian of this State, who replied as follows:

Dr Barnett A. Elzas,
Charleston, S. C. February 11, 1903.
Dear Sir:

In reply to your letter of 10th, asking me whether I consider Mr A. S. Salley, Jr, the secretary of the South Carolina Historical Society, competent to speak with authority on matters relating to the history of the State, I readily reply that I do. I regard Mr Salley as one of the very best and most accurately informed students of the subject with whom I am acquainted, and one fully competent to speak with authority on matters relating thereto. Besides being secretary of the Society, he is editor of the Historical and Genealogical Magazine, published by that body, a position which he fills with great success. I have frequent occasion to consult Mr Salley upon this subject, and always with profit and advantage.

I am, dear sir,

Yours very truly,

(Signed) Edward McCrady.

Mr Salley has sent me the following statement:

Mr Huhner is in error when he states that the Jews seem to have influenced a general election in 1702. The minority considered their votes illegal, and wished to throw out the election as an illegally conducted one. There were not enough Jews in the community to have affected the general result.

Moses Lindo was not inspector general for South Carolina. Inspector general was a military office. He was inspector general of Indico—a purely civil office.

Mr Huhner says that Francis Salvador was a member of the Colonial Assembly as early as 1774, and of the Provincial Congress as well. Salvador was never a member of the Commons House of Assembly (or Colonial Assembly, as Mr Huhner calls it,) nor was he a member of any legislative body in South Carolina in 1774. Mr Huhner finds in Force's "Archives" that Salvador was a member of the General Assembly in 1776. He seems unable to comprehend the difference between the Assembly of the Province in 1774 and the Assembly of the State in 1776. These were two entirely different bodies.

There are several authorities in which a student can find the names of Jewish Tories. Sabine's "Loyalists" and the list of confiscated and amerced estates given in Vol. VI, Statutes at Large of South Carolina, ought to be known to all who

undertake to write of the Revolutionary period in South Carolina. The petition to Clinton cannot be regarded as a recently discovered document. It is and has been for generations a perfectly familiar paper to all who have done research work here. If Mr Huhner had consulted any local worker he could have been informed on that point. It cannot be urged that its absence from a New York library excuses ignorance of its existence. Rich though the New York libraries are in Americana, they possess comparatively little on South Carolina. The materials for writing the history of this State are only to be found here. It is likewise erroneous to call Munsell's "Siege of Charleston" "the standard work on the subject.' It is another work prepared from a distance.

That there were British sympathizers among the Jews of Charleston is abundantly evidenced by the fact that numbers of them continued to do business in Charleston during the period of British occupation. This is shown by the Gazettes. Those who had been hostile were sought out by the British and either banished or forbidden to do business.

There was no company of volunteers organized in Charles Town in 1779, nor was Lushington's company composed almost exclusively of Jews. The Militia Act of 1778 prohibited the organization of volunteer companies after its passage. The company of the Charles Town regiment of militia, commanded during a part of the Revolution by Capt Richard Lushington, had been in existence since 1755, and during at least two years of the war—1778-1780—contained a number of Jews, but they by no means constituted the greater part of the company, as our records will show.

Mordecai Shettall was not commissary general of South Carolina.

Mr Huhner errs about Franklin J. Moses, and confuses the second Myer Moses with his father. That Myer Moses, Jr, was not one of the first "commissioners of education" Dr Elzas has proved beyond argument.

I take no note of the dates referred to in the matters of the Congregational History of Beth Elohim. Dr Elzas has the original minutes and should know of what he writes.

Mr Huhner's reference to the part played by the Jews of Charleston in the Confederate war is trifling in the extreme. A. S. Salley, Jr.

Is there any excuse for an article with so many mistakes being allowed to find its way into an Encyclopaedia which claims to be authoritative? The question of whose initials are appended to an article is insignificant. We have a right to know however, whether the Jewish Encyclopaedia is to be a work in which only the best work of the best available men is incorporated or whether it is to be merely a convenient publication of the efforts, good, bad and indifferent, of the friends of the department editors.

Yours obediently, Barnett A. Elzas.

Perhaps Mr Huhner is satisfied. Perhaps Mr Cyrus Adler is satisfied. Perhaps the Funk & Wagnalls Company are satisfied. For myself, the matter is now closed.

Barnett A. Elzas.

Charleston, February 13.

THE DAUGETT PRTG CO CHARN. S. C.

MOSES LINDO.

A Sketch of the Most Prominent Jew in Charleston in Provincial Days.

...BY...

Dr. BARNETT A. ELZAS,
Rabbi of K. K. Beth Elohim.

(Reprinted from the Charleston News and Courier, Jan. 19)

MOSES LINDO.

A Sketch of the Most Prominent Jew in Charleston in Provincial Days.

The subject of this sketch is a most interesting figure in the early days of South Carolina's history. Who Moses Lindo was, I do not know. I only know what is related of him in that wonderfully rich and priceless collection of Gazettes that is to be found in our own Charleston Library alone. I have as yet made no attempt to trace him in London. I shall do so later and I am satisfied that I shall have no difficulty in finding out something more about him. I am personally acquainted with several members of the Lindo family in London, which has been notably connected with the Spanish and Portuguese community of that city for several generations. Picciotto in his charming "Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History," (p. 124,) makes mention of a Moses Lindo, Jr. as a prominent member of the "Deputies of British Jews," a body appointed "To watch all Acts of Parliament, Acts of Government, laws, libels, addresses, or whatever else may affect the body of Jews," and which is to-day the most influential organization of Jews in the world. He may be a son of our Moses Lindo. The latter was himself an important personage in London prior to his coming to South Carolina. He himself tells us (January 19, 1767:) "I have been allowed to be one of the best judges of Cochineal and Indico on the ROYAL EXCHANGE, for upwards of 25 years past, and have not been thought unworthy (when Sir Stephen Theodore Jansen represented the city of London in Parliament) to be called with Mr Samuel Torin and Mr Daniel Valentine, to give my sentiments of Carolina Indico to the hon. House of Commons of Great Britain." Suffice it to say, then, that he was an expert indigo sorter, in London, who, noticing that a particularly fine grade of indigo was received from South Carolina, changed his headquarters in 1756 from London to Charles-Town. The rest of his story cannot be better told than by the Gazettes themselves.

We first meet with Moses Lindo in the Gazettes, some three months before he arrives in Charles-Town. The following is the first notice of him and appears in the supplement to the "South Carolina Gazette" of Thursday, August 19, 1756.

"A Correspondent in London, has sent us the following Advertisement, and with it proper Directions for making Lime Water to subside Indico.

"To the Printer of the Public Advertiser:

"SIR:

"I HAVE examined the major Part of the Carolina Indico entered this year, and have the Pleasure to find a considerable Quantity equal to the BEST French; and tho' there is some inferior to the Sight by 3s. 6d. per Pound, yet on using it as under, I am convinced the Inferiority is not more that 1s. 6d. a Pound. Therefore, Sir, your publishing this, will be a singular Service to the consumer, and consequently oblige.

"Your constant Reader,

"Moses Lindo, Wormwood-street.

"The Carolina of the above Sortment must be ground finer than the French, and cast into Blood-warm Water three Days before Use, drawing off the Water every 24 hours, and casting fresh, and adding a 5th Part more Madder than usual. The Cause of its not working free is, that some of the Makers at Carolina are unacquainted when their Lime-Water is proper to subside the Indico."

"THE DIRECTIONS.

"The proper Lime-Water for Indico must be the Third Water: The First cast away after four Hours, the Second after eight; but the Third must stand ten, which will be more Acid than alkaline. The Crust that rises on the Water must be carefully taken off, otherwise it will cause the Mould, which would appear in the Indico white, to be the colour of rusty Iron.

"It would be greatly to the advantage of the Maker, if the Pieces were an Inch and a half square."

FROM LONDON TO CHARLES TOWN.

The next notice of Moses Lindo is the announcement of his arrival in Charles-Town.

"MOSES LINDO gives this public Notice, that he is arrived from London, with an Intent to purchase Indico of the Growth and Manufacture of this Province, and to remit the same to his Constituents in London, classed, sorted and packed in a Manner proper for the foreign market.—If any are desirous to know upon what Credit, and to what Extent he purposes to carry on his Branch of Business, he begs leave to refer them for Particulars to Mr John Rattray, who is possessed of his Papers, and to whom he is recommended."

(The South Carolina Gazette, November 11, 1756.)

The magnitude of Lindo's business transactions may be gathered from the following:

"Whereas I have employ'd the Sum of One Hundred and Twenty Thousand Pounds Currency in the Produce of this Country, besides 30,000 Pounds in Prize-Goods and other Articles, all which are paid for, as appears by my Receipt-Book, except about 3,800 Pounds Currency, 2,000 of which does not become due 'till the 22d Instant. The Remaining 1,800 Pounds I have my objections for not paying.

"NOW THIS IS TO GIVE NOTICE, to every Gentleman, Planter and Trader in this Province, who has any Demands on me, that they come and receive their Money from the 15th to the 25th Instant. If any One should take the Liberty of contradicting the above Advertisement, or give out any other malicious Insinuation, in order to prejudice me in the Good Opinion of those I have dealt with, I shall esteem it one of the greatest Favours done to me, to let me know the same by a Line, and their Names shall be concealed. And if such Information comes from a person of middling Circumstances, on due Proof thereof, I do hereby promise to reward him with the Sum of Five Hundred Pounds Currency.

"I return my Thanks to those Gentlemen who assisted me in taking my Bills for 12,000 Pounds Sterling; and to the Planters of Winyah and those of the Southward, for giving me the Preference of their Indico. And do hereby assure them, that (if it please God I live 'till the next Season) I will not let their Fine Indico Fall under 20 Shillings per Pound, having all the Reason to believe I shall have 200,000 Pounds Currency to lay out

the ensuing Year in that Article; wherefore I hope they will not be discouraged.

"MOSES LINDO

Whoever is desirous of being informed what I paid for what I bought, may know of William Branford, John Hutchinson, John Butler, William Gibbs, Jonas Butterfield, Andrew Gowan, &c. &c.

"N. B.—If any Person is willing to part with a plantation of 500 Acres, with 60 or 70 Negroes, I am ready to purchase it for ready money. Please to leave a Line directed to me at Mrs Shepard's in Tradd-street, and Secrecy shall be observed if not agreed on."

(Supplement to the South Carolina Gazette, March 10, 1757.)

A SCIENTIFIC EXPERIMENTER.

Moses Lindo was not only an expert indigo sorter, but was also a scientific experimenter with dyes. He sought to encourage investigation, likewise, on the part of others by offering prizes for discoveries if they proved to be of value. Witness the following:

"Mr Timothy:

"I HAVE made Trial of Two CRIMSON DYES lately discovered in this Province; and in Justice to Mr John Story of Port Royal, Carpenter, I am obliged to declare that I find his Crimson called JOHN'S-BLOOD, answers all the Purposes of Cochineal; for it dyes a fine Crimson on Cotton, so as to stand washing with Soap-Lees; and it is my firm Opinion will likewise dye Scarlet. I have sent Samples of it Home, via Bristol, that, when approved of in London, by Messrs George Farmer and George Honour, two eminent Dyers there. The said Mr Story may be entitled to Part of the Reward offered by the Society for encouraging Arts, to such as can fix a Scarlet or Turkey Red on Cotton

"And as there are many Roots and Weeds to be found in this Province and Georgia, that will dye REDS, I shall be obliged to all who will meet with such in their Way, to send me a Pound dried in the Shade; that I may make Trials of them. And if the Discoverers be persons in middling Circumstances, and what they produce to me be proven a DYE, I will reward them with Fifty Pounds Currency, and use my best Endeavors to obtain for them further Gratuities from the Dyers' Company in London.

"I am sensible, Mr Timothy, you are a Well-Wisher to the Interest of this Province and the Mother-Country; therefore, hope you will not omit publishing in your Gazettes any Hints tending to the Advantage of both whenever such are offered you: and thereby, amongst others oblige

"Your Constant Reader,

"MOSES LINDO.

"Charles-Town, July 16, 1759."

(South Carolina Gazette, Saturday, July 28, 1759.)

Moses Lindo's contract with the London house which he represented having expired, and their agent having failed to pay for the indigo consigned to them, as also his annual allowance, he next announces that during his stay here he would mark Carolina Indico, First, Second and Third Sort, as he had done for them on a reasonable commission. He does not expect to be paid unless the indico so sorted "adds credit to this province and profit to those who chuse to ship that article," so as to prevent impositions by the purchasers of Carolina indico in England.

(South Carolina Gazette, November 14, 1761.)

"AS GOOD AS THE FRENCH."

In the next notice he announces that in consequence of his advertisement of the 12th of November last, several gentlemen have left their indico to his care. He assures the public that out of the twenty thousand weight on board of the vessels under convoy, there are 18,000 as good as the French. Should it appear at home to the purchasers of it, that he has not demonstrated it as such, he says that it will be doing the gentlemen here a piece of service if they will signify his fault in Lloyd's Evening Post, under the attestation of Messrs Mark Hudson Peter Fearon, Aaron Lara and William Richardson, eminent brokers in this and other dyes. "To whose judgment only I submit, as well as to their equity in doing me justice, whether they ever saw so large a parcel of Carolina indico so even sorted as not to differ in value two pence sterling per pound from the first lot to the last."

Lindo had met with such marked success in his business, that he roused the jealousy of his competitors, who seem to have spread false reports concerning him.

He retaliates in this same advertisement.

"As some purchasers of indico may imagine that by this advertisement I want to get more indico to sort, I do hereby declare that I will only do it for those that I am engaged with, they being well known to capital people, and capable of purchasing as much indico of the planters as I can well attend to." He indignantly denies that he owes more than 3,000 guineas in this province than is due to him at home, 'as some people have through their correspondence insinuated to my friends and relatives.'

The advertisement ends with a humorous touch of scorn:

"Sealed with my seal, well known in most markets in Europe for these 25 years, as always prime indico, which to this time of life I have not yet forfeited; and it is to me really a diversion to see some people in this town pretend to be judges of the quality of indico, to one that has had the experience of upwards of thirty years in it; and I wish they may not, by which they have shipped on board the fleet, experience the presumption."

(South Carolina Gazette, February 27, 1762.)

The importance of the indigo industry to the province of South Carolina may be appreciated from the following historical facts: Indigo began to be cultivated in South Carolina in 1744 and was exported to England as early as 1747, where it attracted considerable attention. Great Britain was consuming annually 600,000 pounds weight of French indigo, paying for it £150,000 pounds sterling, and the statistics showed an annual increase of consumption. In 1748 Parliament passed an Act, allowing a bounty of six pence per pound on indigo from the British Colonies. This stimulated the South Carolina production and in 1754 the export of indigo from Charles Town amounted to 216,924 pounds, and shortly before the Revolution, had risen to 1,176,660 pounds.

(Year Book for 1883, pp. 402-3.)

The man who had done more to encourage this important industry (the greatest source of revenue in those days to South Carolina) than anyone in the province was Moses Lindo. This is clearly evident from the following:

"The services heretofore rendered to this province by Mr Moses Lindo, in as-

certaining the quality and establishing the reputation of our indico-manufacture, both at home and at the foreign markets, in April last induced many gentlemen of rank and fortune, merchants, planters and others, to give him the following testimonial of their opinion of his abilities, in writing, and of the necessity of having a public inspector, subscribed with their names, viz:

"In order to bring our indico-produce into reputation at home as well as at foreign markets, it becomes necessary to have a proper person qualified to ascertain the value of our First Sort. We merchants, planters, principal traders and others, do, therefore, hereby certify under our hands, that Mr Moses Lindo, of Charles-Town, merchant, is the only person kown to us, capable of rendering this province further service in that article, if he is willing to undertake ascertaining the same and to grant his certificate for the First Sort."

This testimonial was signed by the Hon William Bull, Lieutenant Governor, 5 Members of his Majesty's Council, the Speaker and 19 Members of the late Commons House of Assembly, 41 merchants and 7 "considerable planters of, or dealers in indico."

THE LEADING INDIGO PLANTERS.

Because of the local interest attaching to the names appended to this testimonial, I print it in full:

*Hon William Bull, Esq, Lieutenant Governor; the Hon Othniel Beale, Esq, *Henry Middleton, John Guerard, *John Drayton and *Daniel Blake, Esqrs, members of his Majesty's Council.

Benjamin Smith, Esq. Speaker, and *Thomas Middleton, *William Moultrie, *Peter Manigault, William Scott, *Thomas Bee, *William Blake, William Roper, *Robert Pringle, *Thomas Lynch, *Rawlins Lowndes, *Benjamin Dart, *John Ainslie, *Thomas Ferguson, *John Parker, *James Parsons, *William Maxwell, *Doct John Murray and *Sir John Colleton, members of the late Commons House of Assembly.

Messrs John Chapman, John Torrans, John Greg, John Poan, *John Smith, Thomas Liston, *Paul Douxsaint, *Miles Brewton, Henry Peronneau, Thomas Corker, John Lloyd, Arthur Peronneau, William Ancrum, Lambert Lance, *Rich-

ard Downes, John Benfield, Henry Laurens, George Appleby, John Logan, Martin Campbell, John Neufville, Edward Neufville, Thomas Ellis, John Scott, Thomas Farr, jun. James Poyas, Evan Jones, *John McQueen, William Guerin, John Parrham, Robert Smyth, Peter Bacot, James Laurens, George Ancrum, Thomas Shirley, George Ingils, Robert Rowand, John Nowell, Samuel Peronneau, Peter Mazyck and Thomas Moultrie, merchants.

Andrew Johnston, John Moultrie, jun, William Gibbes, Job Milner, Alexander Fraser, John Mayrant, William Brandford.

Considerable planters of, or dealers in indico.

(Note—The gentlemen with the mark * prefixed to their names are likewise considerable planters of indico.)

In consequence of the above testimonial and an application to the Governor, his Excellency, on Tuesday last, was pleased to order the following commission to be issued, viz:

SOUTH CAROLINA:

By his Excellency THOMAS BOONE, Esquire, Captain General, and Governor in Chief, in and over the said Province.

TO MOSES LINDO, GENTLEMAN:

WHEREAS, several of the most considerable inhabitants of the said province, as well planters as merchants, have by a writing signed by them, certified, that, in order to bring the indico produce into reputation at home and at foreign markets, it is become necessary to have a proper person qualified to ascertain the First Sort; and that the said Moses Lindo is the only person known to them capable of rendering the province further service in that article, if he is willing to undertake ascertaining the same, and grant his certificate of its being the First Sort. And, whereas, the said Moses Lindo, in order to give such his certificates the more weight and authority in Great-Britain, has made application to me, that he may be appointed Surveyor and Inspector-General of Indico in the province aforesaid, I, therefore, in consideration of the premises, and being convinced of the fitness and ability of the said Moses Lindo for discharging the said office, do hereby nominate, constitute and appoint

you the said Moses Lindo to be Surveyor and Inspector-General of the Indico made in the said province, for the ends and purposes above mentioned.

This commission to continue during pleasure.

Given under my Hand and Seal at Charles-Town, this 21st day of September, Anno Dom. 1762, and in the second year of his Majesty's reign.

THOMAS BOONE.

By his Excellency's command.

George Johnston for
John Murray, Dep Sec.

(South Carolina Gazette, September 25, 1762.)

The next notice in the Gazette is an announcement of Moses Lindo officially as Surveyor and Inspector General of Indico. It is as follows:

MOSES LINDO.

Surveyor and Inspector-General of INDICO made in South Carolina,

GIVES THE FOLLOWING NOTICES:

That as there is at present no obligation on any merchants or planters to submit their Indico to his inspection, or on him to take that trouble for nothing, he will be ready and willing, after the 16th instant, to inspect any parcel for either, ascertain the FIRST SORT, and his certificate therefor for the small consideration of ONE per cent on the value of the Indico so certified.

That he will make no distinction of persons in inspecting and giving certificates, in regard to the quantity, but will with equal readiness serve a planter who brings only 50 lb to market, as him who may bring thousands.

That where any differences arise, on allowances to be made for bad mixtures, the accidental dampness, or designed wetness of Indico to disguise the quality, he will expect TWO per cent for his decision and ascertaining the value; i. e., ONE per cent from the seller, and as much from the buyer.

That all orders gentlemen intend to favour him with, to purchase Indico on their accounts for exportation, must be delivered to him, or left at Messrs Inglis, Lloyd & Hall's, on or before the 16th instant; after which he will receive no more till those then in his hands are compleated.

And, that no planter or other person may complain that he means to injure them (which is far from his intention) he declares, that he will not buy another parcel, till they have tried the market eight or ten days; when he will purchase, on orders upon some of the principal houses in town, at three months' credit.

N. B.—He begs pardon for having omitted among the subscribers to the testimonial or certificate, in consequence of which he obtained his commission from the Governor, to give the printer the following gentlemen's names: * * *

(South Carolina Gazette, October 9, 1762.)

THE THREE SORTS OF INDIGO.

A few days later Moses Lindo announces:

That he has opened an office on Mr Beresford's wharf, where constant attendance will be given every day in the week, (Saturdays, Sundays and holidays observed at other offices, excepted,) from 8 o'clock in the morning till 1 in the afternoon, in order to survey, inspect and grant certificates for all parcels of indico that shall be brought to him for that purpose of the FIRST SORT.

That he will not give his certificate for any indico, unless the planter produces a proper certificate of its being the growth of his plantation.

That for declaring the first sort, and granting his certificate thereof, he expects to be paid at the rate of twenty shillings currency, for every hundred pounds weight of indico mentioned in such certificates, and the like sum for settling any difference between buyer and seller, on every hundred pounds weight.

That if any planter, in eight days after obtaining his certificate for the First Sort, desires him to procure a purchaser for the same, he in that case expects to be paid 5 per cent commission, if such indico is not in any merchant or factor's hands; but if in a merchant or factor's hands, then only 20s per cent.

That he will not sort, garble and seal the First, Second and Third Sorts of indico of the present crop for exportation, but for the following gentlemen, who favoured him with their orders for that purpose before the 16th instant, or by orders obtained from them; for which his charge will be 3 per cent, Casks and all other expences included.

That all his fees must be paid him before the delivery of his certificates.

That he will not accept, or undertake to execute any orders from Europe or from any of his correspondents elsewhere, to purchase indico for them this crop. And,

That if any unfair dealings should be discovered, by fraudulent mixtures, after he has given his certificate for any parcels of indico, he is determined to expose such intended imposition.

That after the first day of February next, he will not act in this or any other capacity, in purchasing or declaring the qualities of indico, until some regulation is made by Act of Parliament to encourage the planting and manufacturing that valuable dye. * * *

(South Carolina Gazette. October 23, 1762.)

The following will give an idea of the prices brought for South Carolina Indico of the first sort:

"MOSES LINDO, Inspector and Surveyor-General of South Carolina INDICO. Having granted certificates for the FIRST SORT, sold at the prices opposite to the names of the respective makers (which he declares to be equal in quality to the best French that has been taken during the last or present war) viz:

	s. d.	
"His Honor the Lieut. Governor's, sold at..	27 6	per lb
George Saxby, Esq..	40	per lb
John Moultrie, jun. Esq..	40	per lb
Sir John Colleton, Bart..	30	per lb
Mr Edmund Bellinger..	30	per lb
Alexander Fraser, Esq ..	26 and 40	per lb
Mr Charles Elliott..	23	per lb
David Deas, Esq..	27 6	per lb
Mr George Marshal..	24	per lb
John Pamor, Esq..	27	per lb
George Seaman, Esq..	26	per lb
Mrs Mary M. Daniel..	23	per lb
Mr William Campbell..	21	per lb
Mr William Pearson..	25	per lb
Mr Philip Porcher..	27 6	per lb
Mr James Laroach..	22 6	per lb
Mr James Commander..	25	per lb
Mr William Johnson..	27 6	per lb

Part of which is now on board the Boscawen, capt David Jenkins, commander, bound for London.

IN THIS PUBLIC MANNER

Requests, that the commissioners of his Majesty's customs in London, will desire 15 or 16 gentlemen, merchants, salters and brokers, conversant in this trade, to inspect the said indico when landed, and declare their sentiments thereon in all the public papers.

And, whereas, several other parcels of indico have been shipped on board the said frigate, by divers persons, in like packages, which have not been inspected or surveyed by him, he has, therefore, thought proper to give a certificate for every cask that has undergone his inspection, and been sealed by him, specifying in the margin the kind, weight and tare, and registered the same in his office; which certificates Mr William Richardson, broker in London (one of the best judges of indico now left in England) will take care to cancel after inspection. This precaution is so eventually necessary for the interest of a colony where any manufactures are produced, that in England the law has made it felony punishable with death, to counterfeit, imitate or alter any public inspector's mark."

(South Carolina Gazettte, January 15, 1763.)

In his next notice Mr Lindo refers to his last big shipment.

"When the last 55 hogsheads arrive in England, I flatter myself the world will be satisfied of my integrity of heart and the uprightness of my intentions; as well as be convinced, that I have devoted myself to the service of my native country, and equally so to this province; for, if the indico that has undergone my inspection, and obtained my certificates, shall be proved equal in quality to the best French (which I am confident it will) in that case £12,000 sterling per annum bounty will be saved to the Government, and the planter here always sure of getting 25s currency a pound for the First Sort, and in proportion for the Second and Third, which will be sufficient to encourage them to go on in the planting and manufacturing that valuable dye." * * *

IGNORANCE OF SOME PRETENDERS.

It would thus seem as if Moses Lindo had been meeting with criticism and opposition. He ends his long letter: "Your publishing this letter may prevent some

evil-minded persons continuing to insinuate, that, sensible of my superior knowledge and experience in all dyes and drugs to any in Europe or America, I only take the advantage of exposing the ignorance of some pretenders to the like which is not my intention. I must, however, say that no person whatever, that has not been ten or twelve years constantly employed as a broker of indico, can be a competent judge of that article, or the true value of each quality: therefore, an error in judgment after that time must be deemed a crime, not an oversight."

(South Carolina Gazettte, March 26, 1763.)

In his next notice Moses Lindo announces amongst other things, that he will not purchase any Indico himself, in less than three or four days after it has been surveyed; when, if no better price can be obtained for it than his valuation, he will receive it at that, and pay for the same as he has hitherto done.

(South Carolina Gazette, October 22, 1763.)

In the Gazette of March 21, 1764, we read that "Moses Lindo, Esq; has lately been presented with the commission appointing him Surveyor and Inspector-General of Indico, under the great seal of the province."

We continue to meet with Moses Lindo in the Gazettes for some years longer. Several of the advertisements are of no particular interest, others are extremely interesting. For the sake of completeness, I shall jot down all the references to him in chronological order. He advertises on October 8, 1764. In his advertisement of May 4, 1765, he refers to "All the iniquitous practices which have been committed with Carolina Indico," and which he declares he will never countenance."

AS A MEDICAL EXPERT.

The next item is very amusing. It occurs in the Gazette of July 28, 1766. Moses Lindo in his investigation into the properties of "roots and weeds," makes a valuable medical discovery, and, while not, as far as I know, a member of the medical profession, he is public spirited enough not to desire to retain the boon for himself, so he writes this letter to the Gazette:

"MR TIMOTHY:

"HAVING lately made a valuable discovery, the CURE of that grievous and common disease among the Negroes,

called the YAWS. * * * I beg leave to make use of the channel of your paper to make the Recipe public for the good of mankind, without the least view to my private advantage; and to request that such gentlemen whose negroes have been, or may be cured, will make the same publickly known, so as to be communicated to his Majesty's other American dominions. I am yours, &c.

MOSES LINDO,
Inspector General of Indico.

RECIPE TO CURE THE YAWS, &c.

To a pound of Poke root, add three ounces of Tobacco, and an ounce of Roman Vitriol, boil the same in five quarts of water, till reduced to a gallon, and strain it. With this, wash the infected part three times a day. A pint is sufficient for ten or twelve days.

At the same time use a diet drink, made of Two pounds of Lignum Vitae shavings, four ounces of the bark of Sassafras root, four ounces of Anniseeds, and half a pound of brown sugar, boiled in four gallons of water till reduced to three. The patient to take a pint a day, mixed with three pints of water for twenty days.

Being a member of the medical fraternity, and morally bound by the ethics of the profession—one rule in the code of which is, that all valuable discoveries are to become the property of all, I hasten to announce my discovery to my confreres and hope that they may find the recipe as useful for the cure of the "Yaws," as did its original discoverer Moses Lindo.

Moses Lindo advertises again on November 10, 1766, and on January 19, 1767, he writes a long letter to Mr Timothy on the present status of Carolina Indico abroad.

"I have lately observed with concern, in an account of a public sale of 12 casks of French, and 23 of Carolina Indico on the 28th of August last * * * that all the French sold at 4s 5d per lb, while only one cask of the Carolina allowed to be fully as good as the best French, obtained no more than 3s 8d, and all the rest sold amazingly low." He attributes the difference to a combination at home among the importers of foreign indico, to discourage its cultivation in his Majesty's Colonies. He "publickly avers" that the Carolina Indico, which he distinguishes as FIRST SORT, properly prepared by the

dyer, will yield a superior dye to the very best French. He ought to know more certainly than the generality of people for "I have been allowed to be one of the best judges of Cochineal and Indico on the ROYAL EXCHANGE, for upwards of 25 years past; and have not been thought unworthy (when Sir Stephen Theodore Jansen represented the city of London in Parliament) to be called with Mr Samuel Torin, and Mr Daniel Valentine, to give my sentiments of Carolina Indico to the hon. House of Commons of Great Britain."

OUR FIRST PLEA FOR "PROTECTION."

Lindo was a man of resources and a true protectionist. He suggests, that as there exists a préjudice of 25 per cent against Carolina Indico brought about by the combination, that the British Parliament, instead of continuing the present bounty, should lay 1s a pound duty on all the French, exported from Britain and which would save no less than £12,500 per annum to the Government and at the same time give sufficient encouragement to cultivate 1,500,000 lb in his Majesty's Colonies, for the use of British manufactories. * * * As Inspector-General of Indico in this province (though without a salary) he thinks it his duty "to rescue that valuable branch of our staples from the malign influence of designing men," as far as it lies in his power.

In the Gazette of October 10. 1771, Moses Lindo has a lengthy communication in defence of the custom of packing Carolina Indico in the Spanish shape. "Judges," he says, "never buy from outward appearance; they will examine its inward Quality. Therefore, there can be no Fraud in the Imitation." He quotes in defence of his contention the custom of mercers who, in order to get off their fine silks, are often obliged to call them French, though wholly wove in Spitalfields. He makes several observations on Carolina, Florida and Guatemala Indico and ends by the statement that he has the interest of this country "as disinterestedly as much at heart" as any native, and is resolved to spend the remainder of his days here, where merit will meet with its reward, without partiality, from the highest to the lowest of its inhabitants.

In the Gazette of July 23, 1772, Moses Lindo advertises that it would afford him great satisfaction, if three or four persons, well experienced in the Indico business, would undertake the sorting and garbling of Indico for exportation, by which means that valuable produce might recover its reputation both at home and at foreign markets. His own services are only at the disposal of his regular patrons, whose names are appended * * *

On August 6, 1772, there is an announcement that Moses Lindo, Esq, has resigned the Place of Inspector-General of Indico for this province.

On August 20, 1772, Lindo publishes a letter to Henry Laurens, Esq. containing his reasons for refusing to act any longer as Inspector-General of Indico. He would not seal certain classes of Indico "and bring disgrace on the Seal with a Crown over G. R." He would still continue, however, to serve his friends, if his knowledge can be of any use to them.

On November 12, 1772, he advertises again vindicating the action he has taken.

SENDS A TOPAZ TO THE QUEEN.

The next item is a most interesting one and deserves to be investigated if only for curiosity, by some English-Jewish antiquarian. It occurs in the Gazette of March 15, 1773.

"Moses Lindo, Esq, his Majesty's Inspector General of Indico, having, about eight years ago, accidentally met with, and for a Trifle purchased, a Stone (among others) found in this province, which he judged to be a WATER SAPPHIRE or TOPAZ, and then declared to be too valuable a jewel to be possessed by any other than the Queen of England, making a Vow, that it should be sent to her Majesty; we hear, has accordingly sent the same, in the Eagle Packet-Boat, by the Hands of the Right Hon Lord Charles-Greville Montague, to be presented to her Majesty. The size and shape of this Stone is like Half a Hen's Egg, and the Weight 526 Carats."

I confess that I am curious as to the subsequent fate of this stone and I propose to try and find out something further about it.

On September 6, 1773, Lindo publishes a lengthy letter to Mr John Ledyard, of Melksham, in Wiltshire, pointing out many fallacies in the statements made abroad concerning Carolina Indico and showing him how he may prove his own statements by actual experiment, the materials for which he is sending him. This letter is a splendid illustration of Lindo's patriotic feeling and of his untiring efforts in behalf of the province.

On November 22, 1773, Lindo makes a statement of the fight he is making against the combination in London against Carolina Indico. He recites what he has done to promote the welfare of the province and refers to a recommendation that is to be made to the General Assembly to allow him a yearly salary besides fees. He has not become wealthy as the result of his work: "Should any accident befall me thro' the infirmities of age or otherwise, I am persuaded it is not difficult for you, or any of my friends to conceive how very wretched a being would be Yours, &c,

"MOSES LINDO."

He still signs himself Inspector-General of Indico.

On December 27, 1773, there is a notice that 13,000 pounds weight of Indico, belonging to two planters, were last week sold by Mr Samuel Prioleau, jun, at a Dollar a pound to Moses Lindo, Esq; Inspector-General, who has declared that the whole quantity is equal if not superior to any French that, in the many years' experience he has had, has gone thro' his hands, or fallen under his observation.

DIES HERE IN 1774.

Moses Lindo died in 1774. The South Carolina Gazette in which he had advertised so extensively for so many years, makes no mention of his death, but in the South Carolina Gazette and Country Journal of Tuesday, April 26, 1774, we read:

Charles-Town April 26, DIED, Moses Lindo, Esq; for many years Inspector-General of Indico in this Town.

There is but one notice more and that in the South Carolina Gazette of May 23, 1774: "Moses Lindo, Inspector-General of Indico, having departed this life, his Estate and Effects * * * will be sold at public outcry on Saturday, the 11th of June next." * * *

I have thus kept track of the subject of my sketch from the time he landed in South Carolina till his death. Moses Lindo left no will. The inventory of his estate, dated May 17, 1774, and appraised at £1,199.17.8 is recorded in the Probate Office Book V, p. 581. It has been a pleasure to me to perpetuate the memory of this public spirited and patriotic Jew who was a resident of Charles-Town from 1758 to 1774. He is but one example of many of his faith who have contributed in no small way to the upbuilding of this great country.

THE DAGGETT PRINTING CO.,
CHARLESTON, S. C.

DOCUMENTS

Relative to a proposed settlement of Jews in South Carolina in 1748.

...BY...

Dr. BARNETT A. ELZAS,
Rabbi of K. K. Beth Elohim.

[Reprinted from the Charleston News and Courier, Feb. 1903.]

DOCUMENTS

Relative to a proposed settlement of Jews in South Carolina in 1748.

Before resuming my narrative of the story of the Jews of Charleston, there are certain preliminary considerations to be made.

The communal history of the Jews of Charleston dates from 1730, though, as we have seen, Jews lived here for over fifty years before this. They were certainly here in sufficient numbers to have met for regular worship twenty years before, though they were neither numerous nor wealthy enough to organize a congregation with a special place of worship and with a quota of paid officials.

How did the Jews come here? Did they come to Charleston as a colony, as did the Jews of Savannah? When did they come? Here facts and local traditions are in conflict.

Local tradition tells that some time between 1732 and 1739, Moses Cohen the first Haham or Chief Rabbi, came to Charleston bringing with him from London a settlement of Jews, who afterwards formed the first congregation K. K. Beth Elohim. This tradition can no longer be accepted.

The State Paper Office in London has preserved an immense number of documents relating to South Carolina. Thirty-six large volumes of these MSS documents have been copied and are available in Columbia. I was much gratified recently in my research to find amongst these papers the entire data relative to a proposed settlement of Jews in South Carolina in 1748. These papers settle the question absolutely. Before giving them in detail, however, I must again quote Picciotto's "Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History"—

an indispensable work for the historian of the Jews of South Carolina. This is what Picciotto has to say on the subject:

"The questions of labor, of the poor, and of emigration," he writes, (pp 152-3.) "appear to have vexed the minds of the chiefs of the Sephardi community during last century, just as they bewilder at present other important bodies. Notwithstanding the presence of many persons in affluent circumstances among the Jews, the poor unfortunately have always been in greater numbers than the totality of the Hebrew population warranted. A hundred years ago the Jews possessed no middle class. There were perhaps 150 to 200 families that might be considered rich, about two-thirds of which belonged to the Spanish and Portuguese congregation. Then we should find at most as many families engaged in small retail trade, and finally we should see a floating mass, at least five times as numerous as the other two classes together, consisting of hucksters, hawkers, journeymen and others either verging on pauperism or steeped hopelessly in its abyss.

To endeavor to diminish the strain of pauperism by emigration the Sephardi Congregation in 1734 appointed a committee to apply for grants of land in Georgia, which the British Government was freely distributing to intending emigrants under certain conditions. This committee remained standing for some years, but we do not gather that it led to any practical results. Three years afterwards the committee reported that some lands in Carolina had been offered to them, and that they were negotiating on the subject. In 1745 this committee was still in existence, and obtained an extension of powers and an allowance to cover expenditure. After this time we hear no more of it, and it is fair to assume that had it achieved any-

thing worth recording it would have been recorded."

Picciotto is correct in his surmise. There had been a proposition to settle Jews in South Carolina, but the negotiations came to nothing. Here are the documents in full and they are now published for the first time:

From the B. P. R. O. JOURNALS B. T. Vol. 56.

Public Records of South Carolina, Vol. 23, 1748-1749.

6TH APRIL 1748.

Read the following order of the Lords of the Commee. of Council vizt.

Order of the Lords of the Committee of Council for Plantation Affairs, dated the 26th March 1748 referring to this Board the humble petition of John Hamilton, Esqr, praying for a Grant of 200,000 Acres of land in the Province of South Carolina and directing them to report their opinion thereupon.

19TH, APRIL 1748.

The Board pursuant to the Minutes of the 6th instant, took into their Consideration three orders of the Lords of the Committee of Council for Plantation Affairs, referring them to the humble petition of John Hamilton Esqr. for a Grant of 200,000 Acres of Land in South Carolina.

* * *

After some time spent therein, the Secretary was directed to write to Mr Hamilton to attend the Board on Wednesday the 27 instant, upon the subject of the said petition

27TH, APRIL 1748.

Mr Hamilton attending as desired, their Lordships had some discourse with him concerning his petition for a Grant of 200,000 Acres of Land in South Carolina, referred to them by an order of the Lords of the Committee of Council, mentioned in the minutes of the 6th Instant, and he acquainted their Lordships, that he had entered into Engagements with Mr Solomon da Costa and other eminent Jews residing here, as also with other Persons for the Transportation of People and providing them Necessaries to carry on his intended Settlement, and that a considerable sum of Money had been advanced for that purpose; Whereupon their Lordships desired that he would bring such Persons as he had engaged with upon this Occasion, that the Board might receive all necessary Satisfaction in this Affair and likewise that he would lay before them such conditions as he had entered into with them, and Friday the 29th, was appointed for his further attendance.

29TH APRIL 1748. (MEMORANDUM.)

Mr Hamilton attended this day as desired by the Minutes of the 27th Instant upon the subject of his Petition for a Grant of 200,000 Acres of Land in South Carolina but there not being a sufficient Number of Commissioners present to constitute a Board the Consideration of this Affair was postponed to another Opportunity.

5TH JULY, 1748.

Read a letter from Mr Hamilton to Mr Pownall dated the 30th of June 1748 Inclosing

A further Proposal upon his Petition praying for a Grant of 200,000 Acres of Land in South Carolina.

Resolved to take Mr Hamilton's said Petition into Consideration tomorrow Morning and the Secretary was directed to write to Mr Hamilton to desire his Attendance tomorrow morning at Eleven o'clock.

6TH JULY 1748.

Mr Hamilton attending as desired, their Lordships had some Conversation with him upon the subject of his Petition for 500,000 Acres of Land, in the Province of South Carolina, whereupon he acquainted their Lordships, that he desired to take up no more land at first than should be sufficient to settle the People he should carry over with him at the proportion of 100 Acres for every white person Jews or Christians, and so from time to time to take up the like Quantity for every person he should bring into the Province, the Land to be granted to him upon a Certificate from the Custom House Officer in the Province of the Number of Persons imported—the Land to be taken up rough and smooth as it runs and as near together as possible, and in order to show a further Probability of his making a Settlement he acquainted their Lordships that a Gentleman whose name was Hempe was ready to engage to send him as many German Protestants as he should have Land to settle upon from time to time as he should have occasion for them: Whereupon he was directed to attend again on Friday and to bring that Gentleman with him and likewise to reduce his Proposall into writing and lay the same before the Board.

8TH JULY 1748.

Mr Hamilton attending as desired by the Minutes of the 6th instant laid before the Board the following further Proposals upon his Petition for a Grant of 200,000 Acres of Land in the Province of South Carolina Vizt.

That he may be intitled by His Majesty's Order to take up from time to time no more than 100 Acres of Land for each White Person Jews as well as Christians he shall bring into, and that shall afterwards be brought to settle in the said Province under his Direction; And that he may be intitled to take up none by virtue of such order but upon a certificate of an Officer of the Customs that the People are arrived in the Province, upon whose Account he is to take it up.

That the Lands shall be run out from time to time, where he can have it good and bad as it runs as near together as possible, all the Lands to be taken up to be free of Quit Rent for the first ten Years from the Date of each Grant under the Seal of the Province and afterwards to pay 4s. Proclamation Money per ann. for every hundred Acres.

At the same time Mr Hamilton acquainted their Lordships that Dr Hempe whom he was to have brought with him, was prevented by his other Affairs and would attend their Lordships on Tuesday next.

26TH JULY 1748.

Their Lordships further took into Consideration Mr Hamilton's Proposals mentioned in the Minutes of the 8th Instant, and ordered the said Proposals to be sent to Mr Solomon da Costa, for his opinion thereupon, and whether he and the rest of the Jews concerned with Mr Hamilton are willing to engage in the said undertaking upon these Proposals, agreeable to what they had before agreed upon, mentioned in the Minutes of the 22nd, of December.

8TH DECEMBER 1748.

Read a letter from Mr Solomon Da Costa to the Secretary dated the 2nd day of Sept

1748 relating to Mr Hamilton's last Proposal on his Petition for a Grant of 200,000 Acres of Land in South Carolina signifying that if the Board think proper to comply therewith, they will then consider in what manner to carry the same into Execution.

Ordered that the Secretary to write to Mr Solomon Da Costa to know positively whether he and his Associates will adhere to their former Proposition of advancing £6000 in case the Board shall think proper to recommend the making a Grant to Mr Hamilton according to his said Proposal.

13TH, DECEMBER 1748.

Read a letter from Mr Solomon Da Costa dated the 12th day of Dec. 1748, in answer to one from Mr Hill mentioned in the Minutes of the 8th, Inst, desiring him to acquaint the Board, that the Intention of himself and his Associates was to make the first Outset with £2000 and they should increase that Sum, if they found it answer their Expectations.

Ordered that the Draught of a Report to the Lords of the Committee of Council, be prepared pursuant to their Lordships order referring Mr. Hamilton's Petition for 200,000 Acres of Land in South Carolina mentioned in the Minutes of the 6th of April last which their Lordships are of Opinion, will not be fore His Majesty's Service to comply with, Mr. Hamilton not having laid before the Board anything that can induce them to think that he can carry his Proposals into Effect as a Foundation for making such Grant.

14TH DECEMBER 1748

The Draught of a report to the Lords Committee of Council upon Mr. Hamilton's Petition for 200,000 Acres of Land in the Province of South Carolina Ordered to

be prepared by the preceding Day's Minutes was laid before the Board agreed to transcribed and signed.

B. P. R. O. South Carolina B. T. Vol 15 1 9

26th March 1748

At the Council Chamber Whitehall
the 26th of March 1748

By the Right Honorable the Lords of the Committee of Council for Plantation Affairs.

His Majesty having been pleased by His Order in Council of the 22nd of this Instant to referr unto this Committee the humble Petition of John Hamilton Esqr, Setting forth That there are great Tracts of Land in the Province of South Carolina lying ungranted and uncultivated, and that having discovered an Improvement in Manufacturing Plantation Pitch and Tar, and also a Species of Essential Oyl which will be useful in all His Majesty's Dominions.

He has engaged with some Merchants of Fortune and Integrity who have agreed to advance a large Sum of Money to make an extensive Settlement and to advance all necessary Sums from time to time for transporting Inhabitants to that Province, and therefore humbly praying, that His Majesty will be graciously pleased to grant him 200,000 Acres of Land in South Carolina to be taken up together in a convenient Place for Manufacturing and Shipping off those Commoditys for England, if so much can be had together in such convenient Place, if not, that the Petitioner may take it up in Parcels not less than 12,000 Acres in a Parcel, and not more than Ten Miles Distant from each other, if such Parcels can be so taken up, without the lands of others interfering, and that the Petitioner may be at

Liberty to take up the same from time to time as he shall bring People to settle thereon, and to have the whole comprehended in one or more Grant or Grants as it shall appear expedient. And that the Quit Rent may be remitted for the first Ten Years from the date of each Grant, and afterwards to pay the usual Quit Rent of Four Shillings Proclamation Money per Annum for each hundred Acres--The Lords of the Committee this day took the said Petition into their Consideration and are hereby pleased to referr the same (a Copy whereof is hereunto annexed) to the Lords Commissioners for Trade and Plantations to Consider thereof, and Report their Opinion thereupon to this Committee. W. SHARPE.

To the Kings most Excellent Majesty in Council

The humble Petition of John Hamilton Esqr.

Sheweth

That Your Majesty having most extensive Tracts of Land in Your Province of South Carolina, lying ungranted and uncultivated which were they settled with industrious People would at the same time increase the Revenue of the Crown the Trade and Navigation of England, and the Strength of that and the Adjacent Provinces.

That your Petr. having discovered an effectual Improvement in the Manufacturing the Plantation Pitch and Tar, which will excell all other, and prove very advantagious to your Majesty's Navy, and all British Shipping, and may soon save this Nation great Annual Sums of Money which now goes to Sweden &c. for those Commoditys, as also a species of Essential Oyl which will be as usefull in all your Majesty's Dominions.

That in order to make an extensive Settlement and extend the Manufacture of those useful Commoditys in the said Province which is peculiarly adapted thereto, as also to the raising of other Produce of principal use in several British Manufactures, Your Petitioner has engaged with him some Merchants of Fortune and Integrity, who have agreed to advance a large Sum of Money for that purpose, and to advance hereafter all necessary Sums from time to time for transporting Inhabitants they are to send carry on the Trade &c. Wherefore as very extensive tracts of Land will be requisite to Parcel out to such People as the benefit of carrying on these Advantageous Manufactures, and raising such Produce, will induce to remove to the said Province under the Direction of Your Petitioner.

Your Petitioner therefore most humbly Prays Your Majesty will be graciously pleased to grant to Your Petitioner 200,000 Acres of Land in the said Province to be taken up together in a convenient Place for Manufacturing and Shipping off these Commoditys for England, if so much can be had together in such convenient Place if not, that Your Petitioner may take it up in Parcels not less than 12,000 Acres, in a Parcel, and them not more than Ten Miles distant from each other, if such Parcels can be so taken up without the Lands claimed by others interfering. And that Your Petitioner may be at liberty to take up the same from time to time as he shall bring People into the Province to Settle thereon, And to have the whole Comprehended in one or more Grant or Grants as it shall appear most expedient. And that the Quit Rent may be remitted for the first Ten Years from the date of each Grant made under the Seal of the Province, and afterwards to pay the usual Quit Rent of Four Shillings Proclamation

Money per Annum for each hundred Acres.

And Your Petitioner will ever Pray.

Received April ye 3d

Read Do ye 6th 1748

B. P. R. O. South Carolina B. T. Vol 15 I 11

(30th June 1748.)

Sir

I am extremely sory yt ye unfortunate Situation.

I have brought myself into, thro' ye pure honesty of my intentions, should lay me under a necessity of giving repeated trouble where I would rather oblige.

I herewith send you a Proposal, which I hope will appear to the Lords a testimony that it is not my View, as I would not have a power to take great Tracts of the Kings Lands whether I can settle it or not; for as I perceive yt to be ye great Complaint, so I would avoid it, knowing I can make my doing so Subservient to the Service of the Crown, under their Lordships Instructions.

When the Board is at leasure to Consider my Petition, I hope you'll be pleased to Communicate this Proposall to their Lordships, and believe at ye same time yt 'tis ye view of ye Danger my Situation threatens me with which has made me more anxiously pre—— perhaps is prudent; but as I did intimate to the Lords what —— extraordinary Case is I hope their goodness will excuse ye—— of my Zeal to be in a condition to Serve my Country in a w—— wants it, and save my Fortune now at Stake for yt Enterprize I am

Sir

Your most humble Servt.

I. HAMILTON.

Stafford Buildings

ye 30th of June 1748

P. S. I would have waited on you with the inc.os'd proposal was I not much indisposed.

To—— Pownell Esq.

INCLOSURE.

Mr Hamilton's Proposalls on his Petition praying for 300,000 Acres of Land in South Carolina.

He proposed to be at liberty to take up no more than 30,000 Acres at first Survey, so much being about the quantity which will be sufficient to parcel out to the People he takes over to the Province with him. And that he shall not have power to take up any more after that, till the People are ariv'd in the Province who he is to settle upon it, but that upon a Certificate of an Officer of the Customs to the Governor, that such people are ariv'd the Petitioner may then be intitled to take up 200 Acres for each white Person that shall come to him, so much being the Proportions generally allowed by their Lordships in former Grants.

The Petitioner being bound this way he humbly presumes effectually prevents him from locking up the Land as has been usual for 10 Years whether it is settled or not, in as much as he cannot take up any, after the first 30,000 Acres, but as he brings People into the Province to Settle upon it; which is asking but just what he can settle, and no more.

That he will take up the first 30,000 Acres altogether in such Convenient place as he can have it, and all other parcels he may afterwards take up shall adjoyn to the first, or be as near it as possible, and be obliged to always take up the Land good and bad, rough and smooth as it runs; and the Governor to make Grants of each parcel as it shall be taken up All the Land to be taken up to be free of Quit rent for the first ten years, from the date of each Grant under the Seal of the Province, and afterwards to pay 4s Proclamation money per Ann for each 100 Acres.

Recd July 1st
1748
Read Do 5th

B. P. R. O. South Carolina B. T. Vol 15 I 12

1st July 1748.

Mr Hamilton's Proposall upon his Petition praying for Land in South Carolina.

That he may be intitled by His Majesty's Order of Council, to take up from time to time 100 Acres of Land for each White Person, Jews as well as Christians he shall bring into, and that shall afterwards be brought, to settle in the said Province under his direction: And that he may be intitled to take up none by virtue of such Order but upon a certificate of an Officer of the Customs, that ye People are arived in the Province upon whose Account he is to take it up.

That he will run the same out from time to time, where he can have it, and good and bad as it runs, and as near together as possible. J. HAMILTON.

Receed July 7th

1743

Read Do 8th

B. P. R. O. South Carolina B. T. Vol 15 I 38

(2d September 1748.)

Sir

The reason why I did not sooner answer their Lordships question with relation to Mr Hamilton's last Proposal (which was delivered to me sometimes since by Mr Pownell, and which I now return to you inclosed) is because Mr Francis Salvador & Mr Benjamin Mendes Da Costa, who are to be concerned with me in that Affair, live all the Summer in the Country, and come to Town but once or twice a Week about their Affairs, and therefore have not been able to have a Meeting with them upon that Subject till this week. When having taken the same into Consideration, we think that if their Lordships shall be pleased to grant Mr Hamil-

ton's request in any shape, it will at all events be fore ye Advantage of the Publick; And when they shall so have done, we will consider in what manner to carry the same into Execution.

I remain with great respect their Lordships &c. Sir.

Devonshire Square
Bishopgate Street London
Friday Morning 2d Sept. 1784

Yr most humble Servt.

Thos. Hill Esqr. Solomon Da Costa.

Recd Sept ye 3d

1743

Read Dec 13.

B. P. R. O. South Carolina B. T. Vol 15 I 37

Devonshire Square London Monday Morning 12th Dec 1743.

Sir

Your favour of the 9th Instant, I received last Saturday when I could not return immediate answer as you require in their Lordships names, by reasons of the day; and also because it was necessary to shew it to my Associates, and consult with them the answer. Which having done, I have now the Honour to acquaint their Lordships (thro your means) that our intention was to make the first Outsett for Two Thousand Pounds, laid out in things necessary for the establishment of our undertaking, in such manner as Mr Hamilton should have advised, and should not have scrupled to encrease it to three times that sum or even more, if we found it answered our expectations, as well with regard to the Publick good, as to our Advantage. I have endeavoured so to explain my self as not to be thought ambiguous, and conclude assuring you that I am Sincerely

Sr

Your most humble Servt.

SOLOMON DA COSTA.

Thos Hill, Esqr
Recd Decbr ye 13th
1748

Read Ditto.

There are no further references to the subject. The negotiations had evidently come to an end.

The above documents make clear these facts: That there was an accession to the Jewish community in Charleston in 1750, that the Jews who came here from London, came not as a colony, but as individuals and that those who came did not belong to the pauper class, who were assisted to emigrate here in order to relieve the strain and stress of relief work at home. This is in perfect accord with the information which we gather from the other sources.

THE DAGGETT PRINTING CO.,
CHARLESTON, S. C.